



AMERICAN SCHOOLS OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

Ethnic Movements in the near East in the Second Millennium B. C. The Hurrians and Their Connections with the Ḫabiru and the Hyksos

Author(s): E. A. Speiser

Source: *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 13 (1931 - 1932), pp. 13-54

Published by: [The American Schools of Oriental Research](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3768469>

Accessed: 26/04/2013 18:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The American Schools of Oriental Research is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ETHNIC MOVEMENTS IN THE NEAR EAST IN THE SECOND MILLENNIUM B. C.

THE HURRIANS AND THEIR CONNECTIONS WITH THE ḪABIRU AND THE HYKSOS

E. A. SPEISER

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

(DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF EDWARD CHIERA)

I. Introductory.

Seven years ago the ANNUAL came out with its first discussion of the Hurrians, in a joint article by Edward Chiera and the present writer, entitled "A New Factor in the History of the Ancient East."¹ Prior to the middle 'twenties Assyriologists had little provocation to concern themselves with the rôle of the Hurrians in Mesopotamia. The presence of that people in the country was attested, to be sure, by the occurrence of their peculiar proper names in a number of cuneiform documents. A certain relationship between the bearers of those names and the speakers of the principal language of the Mitanni had also been established. But the element was demonstrably foreign in Babylonia and there was no reliable information as to the part which it had played in ancient Assyria. Its infiltration was generally considered to be the inevitable result of trade relations with the north-west. The prediction of massed settlements of Hurrians to the north of Akkad would have been branded as visionary.²

With the publications of the tablets from the district of Kirkuk (ancient Arrapha) by Contenau³ and Gadd⁴ the situation was radically altered. Here was definite proof that the Hurrians were well established in the area east of the Tigris. Frequent references to this ethnic group in the archives from Boghazköi helped to place the whole matter in a different light.⁵ With scarcely a note of warning, the area dominated by this people was seen to

¹ ANNUAL VI, 75-92, which gives an account of the older literature on the subject.

² Pioneering work on the subject was done by Ungnad; cf. BA VI, 5, pp. 8 ff., and *Kulturfragen*, I, pp. 4-7.

³ *Textes cunéiformes du Musée du Louvre* IX, 1-46.

⁴ RA XXIII, pp. 49-161. For the other scattered "Kirkuk" texts cf. Koschaker, *Neue keilschriftliche Rechtsurkunden aus der El-Amarna-Zeit*, 9, n. 1. For general discussions of the material available at the time see Contenau, *Babyloniaca* IX, nos. 2-4, and Gadd and Koschaker, *op. cit.*

⁵ The Boghazköi material is now listed by Sommer in his *Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden*, 42 ff.

expand at an alarming rate; many of our previous notions as to the balance of power in the Amarna period had to be rapidly readjusted so as to make room for "Mitannian" influences in eastern Anatolia and in Arrapha.⁶ There was even danger to Palestine from the same quarter.

When our article was published in the *ANNUAL* of 1926, we had not seen the related studies of Gadd and Contenau; the three essays appeared practically at the same time. We had, however, at our disposal the rich material from Nuzi, in south-west Arrapha, which Dr. Chiera had discovered in the course of his first campaign on that site. More than a thousand tablets had been found during that initial season, as compared with approximately one-tenth of that number in the museums of London, Paris, and Berlin. Subsequent campaigns were to make correspondingly large contributions to the rapidly growing Nuzi collection.⁷ By its sponsorship of the Nuzi excavations the American School in Baghdad became thus a vital factor in the study of the Hurrian migrations. It would be difficult to overestimate in this connection the part played by Dr. Chiera, the discoverer and decipherer of the Nuzi documents. His untimely death has just removed from American Assyriology one of its most brilliant and vivid personalities. May these pages serve as a sincere, even though wholly inadequate, tribute to his memory.

At the time of its appearance the title of our joint contribution may have seemed somewhat pretentious; I trust, however, that the tone of our presentation was sufficiently restrained to modify such an impression. Our purpose was to give a brief description of the contents of the tablets together with a tentative analysis of their historical implications. Since then progress in the field has been so rapid that a fresh analysis is now imperative. Earlier discussions must now be supplemented or modified. Our additional information

⁶ Anglicized spelling of foreign names is employed in this paper wherever possible. This is generally the case with the several laryngals represented by *h*. Diacritical marks will be found only in philological discussions and in native terms; hence Hurri, but Hurrian, etc. In Arrapha, however, the mark is necessary to prevent confusion of the *ph* with the *f*-sound.

⁷ So far there have been published five volumes of Nuzi texts discovered by American expeditions; four by Chiera (*Publications of the Baghdad School*, vv. I-III, and *Harvard Semitic Series V*), and one by Pfeiffer, *HSS IX*. Additional tablets from the Louvre have been published recently by Contenau, *RA XXVIII*, 27-39. Among the recent philological studies of these texts may be listed Kramer's *The Verb in the Kirkuk Tablets*, *ANNUAL XI*, 63-119, and two essays by the present writer in the *ANNUAL X*, 1-73, and *JAOS* 52, pp. 350-367; 53, pp. 24-46. Excellent legal discussions will be found in Koschaker, *op. cit.*, and in his contribution to the *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften XLII*, no. 1. There is also a considerable number of minor articles.

is for the most part the result of work done, or made available, within the last two or three years. It is time to survey the situation and to consolidate our gains, so to speak. Our working theories of a few years ago have become certainties by this time, or else been adjudged untenable. Parenthetically, the proportion of the latter is agreeably modest. With a wider and firmer foundation of fact to rely upon, the scope of these investigations may be now legitimately extended.⁸ If the purely theoretical increment is proportionate and gradual, the expansion is not likely to prove too venturesome.

The argument which this paper wishes to pursue will fall thus naturally into two parts. Relevant facts will be reviewed in one section and the partly tentative superstructure will be confined to the other. In other words, the question of the Hurrians themselves will be taken up first, while the problem of interrelations with such migratory groups as the Ḫabiru and the Hyksos will be left for the latter part. As regards the Hurrians, the historical situation is now clear in its main outlines; precision in terminology and a narrowing of the chronological limits of their migrations may be listed as the outstanding desiderata. But the part of the Hurrians in the extensive movements of peoples during the second millennium B. C. still remains to be determined. Their participation in these wanderings is definite and beyond dispute; the extent, however, and the nature of their relations with the other groups in question continue to call forth widely divergent estimates and interpretations. In a study such as the present one an inquiry into the matter cannot be avoided.

The foregoing remarks have defined the character of this paper. The problems are mainly ethnic and historical and the methods to be employed will be adjusted accordingly. Philology and archaeology will furnish their quotas of source material, but the arrangement cannot be modeled very well after linguistic or archaeological studies. Pertinent details from both departments will continue to appear in their own settings.⁹ In fact, owing to the importance of the subject and the constant additions to our sources, the number of contributors is steadily on the increase.

⁸ A previous attempt at such an elaboration was made by the writer in *Mesopotamian Origins*, ch. V. It is probably the result of "making many books" that much of what has been written is not read at all. At any rate, a number of our conclusions have independently been duplicated by others, years after the appearance of our publications. While it is undoubtedly flattering to find oneself in agreement with prominent scholars, it is in sheer self-defense that certain claims to priority are herewith asserted, invidious though the task may be.

⁹ With the publication of fragments of Hurrian vocabularies by Thureau-Dangin, *Syria*, 1931, pp. 234 ff., the problem of Hurrian phonology has become acute. I hope to take part in the discussion in the near future.

II. *Hurri.*

In the earlier stages of Hurrian studies the most pressing problem was to recognize Hurrian material in the extant epigraphical sources, in order to determine the spread of that group in the culture lands of the Near East. Today there is scarcely any difficulty on the onomastic side and, consequently, the geographical boundaries can be established with a gratifying degree of certainty. Through our knowledge of Hurrian proper names we have arrived at the realization that the people in question were to be found, for the better part of the second millennium, scattered all the way from Anatolia to Elam and from Armenia to Egypt, interspersed with other ethnic elements or settled in colonies of their own. It is manifest that mere recognition of certain linguistic features need not presuppose thorough understanding of the language as a whole. We shall not be in a position to interpret Hurrian documents with reasonable confidence until the available material has become much more abundant than it is thus far. Nor can we hope for the time being to do justice to the dialectic differences within the language, which are inevitable over so wide an area as the Hurrians are known to have occupied. Hurrian sources from Nuzi, Ras esh-Shamra, and Boghazköi, naturally have their local peculiarities. These must for the time being be filed away for future consideration; as yet they cannot be adequately analyzed. But it is perfectly obvious that we are confronted in each case with members of the same ethnic group. Thus while a comparative study of Hurrian must await further developments, the time is ripe for an examination of the historical rôle of the Hurrians on a broader basis than has been possible heretofore. Philological and historical methods have come here to a parting of the ways.

It has just been indicated that Hurrian names and other linguistic elements can be recognized readily enough; but what are we to call them once they have been recognized? It is curious indeed that agreement as to terminology should appear more difficult than the actual identification of the elements involved; and yet this is precisely the case. A lengthy discussion with nothing more at stake than a mere name will not, as a rule, be worth the effort. In the present instance, however, a great deal happens to be implicit in the name, and I feel compelled to re-introduce the subject; for this is not a first attempt along these lines.¹⁰ It will be made clear, I trust, in the following pages that with the people under discussion the correct name may furnish the key to a fuller understanding of their part in history. But there is a more

¹⁰ See ANNUAL VI, 79 f., and *Mesop. Orig.*, 129 f., 136 f.; cf. also Hrozný, *Archiv Orientální* (AOr) I, 91 ff., III 285 ff. (where the earlier discussions on the subject are not mentioned, however).

urgent reason for returning to the problem. The number of terms now considered synonymous with or preferable to *Hurri* is bewildering in more ways than one, with the paradoxical result that the very wealth of names threatens to render the people nameless in the eyes of the confused reader. For what is the average student to make of it when he finds one and the same people, and its language, variously designated as *Hurri*, *Harri*, *Hurli*,¹¹ *Hurwu*, or *Murri*; *Shubaru*, *Subaru*, *Suri*,¹² and even *Su*;¹³ *Mitanni*, *Mitlani*,¹⁴ and the like, all in a formidable array of variations? The same volume of an encyclopedia may contain two or three of the rival terms in gay apposition;¹⁵ how is the uninitiated to divine that the several authors have the same thing in mind? Until recently there may have been room for some differences of opinion on this vexing subject. At the present state of our knowledge, however, such gratuitous anarchy amounts to sheer extravagance.

Having discussed the matter at some length in previous publications,¹⁶ I shall now only summarize the earlier results prior to adducing the latest, and to my thinking decisive, evidence. With as widely diffused a people as the Hurrians, it is clear that what we need is a comprehensive term qualified to represent the entire group and not only a particular subdivision. Hence *Mitanni* is automatically eliminated. This name applied properly to the well-known but short-lived empire in central Mesopotamia. Moreover, the designation was strictly political rather than ethnic or linguistic; if current at all in the latter connotations, *Mitanni* would not have been descriptive of the people that concerns us at present, but rather of the Indo-Iranian element to which the empire owed its organization.

Ignoring for the moment the claims of the Subaru group, we now turn our attention to *Hurri* and its alleged congeners. Here the problem is much more involved. The variety of forms encountered in this category springs directly from the polyphonous nature of cuneiform signs. The first syllable of the word is expressed in all cases where the reference is absolutely certain by a sign that is susceptible of several readings, the most common ones being *har*,

¹¹ This term was advocated by Ehelolf, *OLZ*, 1930, col. 323, n. 1; it is used, e. g., by Bossert in his *Santaš und Kupapa*; but see below.

¹² Cf. Winckler, *OLZ*, 1907, cols. 281 ff.

¹³ See Hüsing, *Die Völker Alt-Kleinasiens und am Pontos*, 23. It is to be regretted that this monograph appeared posthumously (1933), without having had the benefit of the author's final corrections. As it stands, the work is out of date by about ten years, which makes an enormous difference in a subject of this sort, particularly when the writer happens to be as erratic as he is brilliant.

¹⁴ Cf. Bork, *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 51 ff.; but see *Afo* VIII, 308 ff.

¹⁵ Cf. *Reallex. d. Assyri.* I, 83 and 233.

¹⁶ See above, note 10.

hur, and *mur*. All three have found ready followers, hence we read of the *Harri*, the *Hurri*, and the *Murri*. The last-mentioned form may be discarded without further ado as the fantastic offspring of Amorite enthusiasts.¹⁷ Not quite as harmless is the contest between the *Harri* and the *Hurri* camps, especially because both readings are fraught with vital historical implications. Hugo Winckler, who ferreted out the word from among his Boghazköi documents, saw in it promptly a reference to the ancient Aryans.¹⁸ Since there was independent evidence for the presence of Indo-Iranians on the scene,¹⁹ Winckler's view carried great appeal. His reputation for uncanny insight into such matters did the rest, and Aryans disguised as *Harri* still loom large in current publications in spite of some serious setbacks which the original theory has suffered.²⁰ For in the meantime the supposedly non-Aryan Hittites have turned out to be strongly Indo-Europeanized,²¹ while Aryan elements have come up in Mitanni and in the neighboring countries. But the whole theory has become invalidated on other grounds as well. Most scholars are now aware of the fact that the language to which the alleged Boghazköi cognate of Indic *ārya* is applied cannot possibly be smuggled into the Indo-European family. And how could philology sanction the equation of *harri* with *ārya*, the alleged *prima facie* evidence for the ethnic identification?²² Moreover, we have seen that the reading with *har* is far from certain. In point of fact, cuneiform usage of the period is overwhelmingly in favor of *hur*; with very few exceptions²³ the syllabic symbol in question is read *hur* in the records from Boghazköi. There is even a strong possibility that our very term occurs

¹⁷ Cf. *Mesop. Orig.*, 131, n. 37.

¹⁸ See above, note 12.

¹⁹ Cf. now Mironov, "Aryan Vestiges in the Near East of the Second Millenary B. C.," *Acta Orientalia* XI, 140-217. The usefulness of this monograph is impaired by the author's inability to control the Near-Eastern sources.

²⁰ For some wondrous statements on the subject cf. Hüsing, *op. cit.*, 25 ff. (the *H*. are simply "blondes"!). The author identifies the group with the Horites of the Old Testament, but is entirely too magisterial with the Masoretic vocalization and ignores the Septuagint transliteration, for no better apparent reason than that he fancies the reading *Hari* (*sic*).

²¹ For a discussion of the linguistic position of Hittite the reader may now be referred to the forthcoming *Hittite Grammar* by E. H. Sturtevant.

²² For the sake of completeness, it must be stated that not all of those who prefer the reading *Harri* would imply thereby an etymological connection with *ārya*. In fact, there are but few who still share this position of Weidner, *Afo* V, 93, n. 3. But when Eduard Meyer (*Geschichte* II. 1 (1928), 6, and *passim*) and Forrer (*Reallex. d. Assy.* I, 233) continue to write *Harri* (*Charri*), although aware of the non-Aryan origin of the people, their reasons for so doing are obscure.

²³ For the exceptions see Sommer, *Ahḫijavā*, 42, n. 1.

spelled out as *hu-ur* . . . , with *u* in the initial syllable.²⁴ As far as the troublesome name is concerned, there is, therefore, in the words of Ferdinand Sommer, "absolutely nothing in favor of *har-*, but some support for *hur-*."²⁵ I have quoted this ranking Indo-European philologist not only on account of the very thorough study of the subject which he has just made, but also because he would be the first to recognize the Aryans if they had left actually any terminological means of identification.²⁶

There are further important arguments in favor of *Hurri*.²⁷ For the time being, however, we may let the matter rest on its present merits. The additional material is of too great historical import to be dragged needlessly into a wasteful dispute about a vowel.

The form of the second syllable of the name is not without its own complications. In fact we should speak of forms, as is made plain by a comparison of *hur-ri-* with *hur-la-*²⁸ and *hur-wu-u-*.²⁹ Fortunately the problems are now purely philological, though by no means simple. For our present purposes it will be sufficient to state that the first form is prevalent in Akkadian, the second in Hittite, and the third in native, i. e., "Hurrian" texts. The probability is strong that all three forms are cognates, Akkadian and Hittite being in this case based on the native word. We should like to know, of course, the precise value of the apparent semivowel in *hur(r)wu-*; ³⁰ information on this point is not available for the present. Again it is logical to assume that in this case, too, *hur-ri* and *hur-la-* are respectively Akkadian and Hittite adaptations from Hurrian. If we are to be thoroughly consistent we should speak

²⁴ Hrozný, *AOr* III, 286; but see Sommer, *loc. cit.*, later modified, *ibid.*, pp. 383-5.

²⁵ Cf. note 23.

²⁶ The same may be said of the other prominent Hittite scholars, such as Friedrich, Götze, and Sturtevant.

²⁷ Cf. Sommer, *op. cit.*, 285. The argument based on the Greek transliteration *Xoppaios* was anticipated in *Mesop. Orig.*, 132 f. The Ras esh-Shamra passages cited by Sommer are indeed a welcome bit of support. But in order to make the comparison convincing, the historical connection must be established in addition to the phonetic correspondence of the terms; see below.

²⁸ The stem is *hurla-*, the adverb used for the language appears as *hurlili*. That Hittite *hurluš* corresponds to Akk. (*amēlūti*) *hurri* in the respective versions of the same text is now conceded by Sommer, *op. cit.*, 286.

²⁹ For the various spellings in the Tushratta letter, which presuppose *w* as the third consonant, see the Index to Knudtzon's *Amarna*, p. 1575.

³⁰ In the West-Semitic forms (Heb. חֲרִי and Ras esh-Shamra, no. 2, lines 12, 21, 28, *hri*) an original *u* (*w*) would be naturally assimilated to the gentile ending *i*. That *hri* is most likely a Nisbe-formation (*hurriiū*) is the view of Friedrich (*Afo* VIII, 239) against Sommer, *Ahhijavā*, 385. For important observations on the Ras esh-Shamra texts cf. Montgomery, *JAOS* 53, 97-123.

therefore of Hurrians, Hurlians, and Hurwians, depending on the language of the texts with which we may be dealing at the time. In strictly philological studies such niceties are indeed inevitable. It is obvious, however, that extremes of this sort could serve no useful purpose in a general discussion. When it comes to deciding between the three, the Hittite representative contains the obscure, very likely local, *l*-element;³¹ on the other hand, the Akkadian correspondent approximates closely to the apparent original form; it has an exact Canaanite counterpart, as will be seen presently; moreover, it has been long in vogue, and it is thus entitled to the right of way.

It may be mentioned in passing that attempts have been made to establish the etymology of the term which has led to this lengthy discourse. The preceding remarks have indicated, I trust, the danger inherent in such an undertaking. Where the precise original form is still subject to doubt, it would seem premature to search for the meaning. Hrozný believes that he has found the key to it in Akkadian *hurru* "hole:" the Hurrians started out as "cave-dwellers." I can only reiterate my original doubts on this point, and my skepticism is now strengthened by recent remarks of Sommer.³² Just why the Hurrians should have borrowed for their national designation a foreign term that is said to mean "troglodytes" remains as obscure and unpalatable as ever. If popular etymology played any part in the matter, it was a secondary development. In other words, the Akkadians may have associated their own *hurru* with the native name of the Hurrians, but not the other way around. The Hittites are hardly likely to have applied to their eastern neighbors a nickname originated by the remote Akkadians. It will be recalled that the identical play on words has figured prominently in the case of the biblical Horites, who cannot be kept out of this discussion very much longer. For our purposes the issue raised by Hrozný is of no real moment, and we need fear little criticism if we fail to digress any further from the main path.

With *Harri*, then, happily out of our way, the contest narrows down to a show of strength between *Hurri* and *Subaru*. There have been but few who ever succumbed to the Harrian theory. *Subaru*, on the other hand, still boasts numerous adherents. It presents a really stubborn case because its

³¹ Sommer, *op. cit.*, 385, is inclined to explain *hurula-* as a secondary, inner-Hittite formation, based perhaps on some popular etymology.

³² Cf. *AOr* I, 98, and my misgivings on the subject in *Mesop. Orig.*, 133. Hrozný goes back to his etymology in *AOr* III, 287, note 1, only to arouse the skepticism of Sommer, *op. cit.*, 386 f. At best, there may be a question of secondary etymology both in Akkadian and in Hittite, though along different lines in each case. The original form is with greatest probability the native *hurwu*, or the like, concerning the etymology of which it would be futile to speculate at present.

advocates have not had to rely on arguments that are so easily vulnerable. In this virtual impasse I should have refrained from bringing the question again to the surface—I have been guilty of similar interference on two previous occasions—if it were not for fresh evidence which, to my thinking, cannot but swing the balance rather decisively. It is not that Hurri has hitherto been lacking in support. Many had decided in its favor prior to, or independently of, our original essay on the subject.³³ But ours was perhaps the first attempt to justify the usage as fully as was possible at the time; a later publication contained additional arguments.³⁴ Writers who have dealt with the subject most recently have shown, as a rule, little hesitation in deciding against Subaru. However, there have been also counter-claims; it is still maintained in some quarters that we have in Subaru the more convenient and comprehensive designation.³⁵ It can be proved, however, that there is no longer any basis for such claims.

It will be borne in mind that what we are after is an appropriate name (a) for a certain language the elements of which we can generally recognize, and (b) for the people who spoke that language. It is now a matter of record that both these usages are attested for the cognates of the term Hurri. The name appears also in a geographical sense, but it has been shown recently that the ethnic connotation has strong claims to priority.³⁶ At all events, the name was applied to the people under discussion, its language, and some of its lands. Furthermore, it was thus applied in certain instances by that people itself. Where, then, is the problem?

Briefly, it is imported from Mesopotamia. Native Akkadian sources tell of a land Subartu, which they locate rather vaguely in the north, somewhere between Amurru and Elam. In its early occurrences,³⁷ *i. e.*, during the third millennium, the term is purely geographical (as is proclaimed outwardly by the ending),³⁸ and it covers an indeterminate and elastic area. Constant is only the general location in the north. But the north was one concept with the Babylonians and another one with the Assyrians. The former included Assyria not infrequently under Subartu; but when at length the name had

³³ Albright, Götze, Bilabel, and others have used Hurri all along.

³⁴ Cf. ANNUAL VI, 79 f.; *Mesop. Orig.*, 136.

³⁵ Cf. Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, 8.

³⁶ Sommer, *op. cit.*, 42 ff.

³⁷ Cf. *Mesop. Orig.*, 129; the earlier discussion by Gadd, *RA* XXIII, 60 ff., is still a valuable contribution; see also Albright, *JAOS* 43, p. 233.

³⁸ The ethnic abstraction *šubari* comes up for the first time in the annals of Adad-narari I (about 1300 B. C.), cf. *Altorientalische Bibliothek* I, 58, n. 2. For the same place-ending cf. e. g., *Elamtu*, *Inzaltu*.

come to be used by the Assyrians, the meaning was more restricted and specialized.

In the early texts, then, we hear only of a land Subartu. There is no reference to "Subareans" as such; at best, we have to allow for the people of Subartu, which makes, however, a considerable difference. For mere allusions to the population of a very general area must not be mistaken for ethnic definitions. When the Akkadians or Babylonians refer to Subartu, they have in mind a certain region in the north; nothing is implied thereby concerning its possible racial or linguistic peculiarities, and there is certainly no indication that any particular people or language is presupposed. As for the Subareans, we are not confronted with them actually prior to the Assyrian annals of post-Amarna times, after political and ethnic conditions in Mesopotamia as well as in the rest of the Near East had undergone very thorough changes and readjustments. And lastly, late Assyrian lexicographers may oblige us by listing "Subarean" glosses; but the derivative linguistic designation will reflect the vagueness of the original geographical term. For the glosses include Semitic words together with Hurrian elements.³⁹ To add to the confusion, Neo-Babylonian writers have no scruples about calling the Assyrians Subarūm, and Assyria Subartu.⁴⁰

We have seen, then, that Subartu started out as a geographical concept; late in the second millennium it acquired an ethnic connotation, and in a linguistic sense it is not attested before the first millennium. In none of these meanings can the usage be called precise. The career of Hurri is a good example of exactly the opposite course. The term is best documented as an ethnicon; its linguistic and geographical connotations are evidently secondary; and there is little ambiguity in any of these usages.

The case being so plain, one might be excused for failing to see in it any problem whatever. Unfortunately, however, all the facts have not been always manifest. In a way, it is a question of seniority: owing to the accidents of discovery, the Subareans had managed to gain a foothold before the Hurrians were in a position to assert their rights. Mitanni started the procession with the letter of its king Tushratta, which first called to our attention the peculiar linguistic background of the people. But with the discovery of related proper names in Babylonia, the need for a more general and inclusive term led to the withdrawal of Mitanni in favor of "Subarean."⁴¹ Hurri has been

³⁹ See Jensen in *ZA* VI, 60, and Frank in *Festschrift Meissner*, 43 f.

⁴⁰ Cf. Ungnad, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* VI, 5, pp. 8 ff.

⁴¹ Ungnad, *loc. cit.*, is to be credited with the introduction of the term in its more pretentious rôle as an official representative of Hurri and its derivatives. The sponsor has proved, however, less consistent, or intransigent, than his followers; for while he

in evidence for only about a decade, and so its elders have refused to yield ground.

The nature of the deadlock must be emphasized once more. Subartu was used in Mesopotamia as a land-name beginning with the third millennium. In course of time Assyrian kings came to refer to a certain people as Subareans, and subsequently Assyrian lexicographers showed some interest in Subarean. Now it cannot be denied that after the Amarna period the above ethnic and linguistic designations actually dovetail in Assyria with Hurri; but it is equally obvious that the former usages lack the necessary precision and exclusiveness. In Mesopotamia, it is true, Subartu and its derivatives were decidedly in vogue; outside of the river lands, however, Hurri was employed not only by the neighbors of that people, but also by themselves. It is significant in this connection that Hurri was current in those countries where the Hurrians are known to have achieved greatest prominence.⁴² One group of scholars could see, therefore, no valid reason for imposing a strictly Mesopotamian name upon outside districts at the expense of the native term. The champions of Subartu countered with arguments of their own, which were not without a semblance of reason. In the last analysis, it was all a matter of individual preference, and so it remained until two years ago.

admits that "Hurrians" is occasionally better than "Subareans" (*Kulturfragen* I, 8, n. 1), the others are not inclined to compromise.

⁴²Subaru occurs in the Amarna letters, written (*mât*)*su-ba-ri*, *zu-ba-ri* (cf. Knudtzon, p. 1579), but the usage is purely geographical in the sense that the name corresponds to Mitanni (*ibid.*, p. 1194). It is interesting that the ending *-tu* is given up, thus paving the way for the formation of the secondary Assyrian ethnicon *šubari*. The name is found also in the alphabetic texts from Ras esh-Shamra (*šbr*, text no. 2, lines 12, 21); but since it occurs by the side of *hri* (Hurrians), it is clear that the two terms are not synonymous; even Friedrich, who uses "subaräisch" as a comprehensive designation for Hurrian in general, is forced to realize that *šbr* may mean simply "Assyria;" cf. *Afo* VIII, 239. The weakness of such an inconsistent position is obvious.

While we are on the subject, it may be pointed out that the initial sibilant varies between *s* and *š*; the former is found as early as Naram-Sin, to judge from a later copy of his inscription (*Royal Inscriptions from Ur*, 274, 13, where we have the gloss *su-bar-tim*); the Assyrian ethnicon has usually *š*, but in the contemporary occurrences of the land-name the sibilants vary again (Boudou, *Liste de noms géographiques*, 160, 169). The final vowel is *i* as a rule, but cf. the form *su-ba-ru-um*, Streck, *Assurbanipal* II, 806 f.

The ordinary geographical name for Mitanni is Hanigalbat; for the various spellings cf. Knudtzon, 1575, and *Mesop. Orig.*, 95. The name occurs, outside of the Assyrian Annals, not only in the Amarna and Nuzi records (*ibid.*), but also in the recently discovered tablets from Tell Billa, which date from the Middle Assyrian period.

And finally, Mitanni is found in an earlier spelling as *ma-i-te-ni*; cf. *HSS* IX, pl. 1, 26, and the commentary in *JAOS* 49, pp. 269-275.

The results of two archaeological expeditions conducted in the season of 1930-31, the American School in Baghdad being a prominent participant in both, finally broke the impasse. It will be recalled that Subartu was alleged to have represented the land of the Hurrians from the very beginning; this was the very corner-stone of the Subarean theory. Now this basic assumption turns out to be groundless. Nuzi, which has given us the bulk of Hurrian names known up to the present, lay in the heart of Subartu. For several centuries during the second millennium Nuzi and the rest of Arrapha supported a large Hurrian population, characterized by its own laws and social customs, its art and its religious elements. The story is told in thousands of documents, covering all phases of daily life.⁴³ Though the ethnic term "Subareans" is not found at that period, the omission will be considered accidental, if it can be shown that Nuzi was as old as Subartu. Or, to put it differently, if the population of the place was Hurrian as far back as the Agade period, when the district is included under Subartu, the Subarean theory holds good for Mesopotamia and the adjoining eastern regions. Now the name Subartu is established for the time of Naram-Sin, of the dynasty of Agade, at which period the whole of Arrapha was part of Subartu.⁴⁴ Were there Hurrians in Nuzi in the Agade period? The excavators have unearthed a strangely negative answer to this question: There were no Hurrians in the neighborhood and, furthermore, there was no Nuzi. The site was inhabited, but its name was then Gasur, while the population was almost entirely non-Hurrian.⁴⁵ It follows conclusively that the Hurrians did not settle in Arrapha until after the Old-Akkadian period, and that this part of Subartu, at least, was held by a heterogeneous group.

Similar results were obtained at Tell Billa, north of Mosul and about a hundred miles northwest of Nuzi. There, too, the Hurrians were well represented in several strata dating from the second millennium. Unlike Nuzi, the evidence from Billa is mostly archaeological, but the Hurrian character of the remains is absolutely certain. Throughout the third millennium the site was also occupied; the early settlements, however, are distinctly non-Hurrian.⁴⁶ And yet, Billa is in the territory covered by ancient Subartu, just as was the case with Nuzi. The considerable distance between the two sites

⁴³ For literature cf. note 7.

⁴⁴ *Ur Inscriptions*, 274. 13, and the discussion by Sidney Smith, *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 73.

⁴⁵ See provisionally the account by T. J. Meek, in *Bulletin*, 48, pp. 2 ff., and now pp. 1 ff. of the present volume. The Old Akkadian texts from Nuzi will be published by Meek in the near future.

⁴⁶ Cf. Speiser, "The Pottery of Tell Billa," *Museum Journal* XXIII, 249 ff., esp. 270-276, and plates lvi-lxv.

tends to prove that these cases are not accidental or exceptional. In short, large portions of Subartu possessed non-Hurrian populations prior to the second millennium. The Hurrians were clearly new-comers who made their appearance at a comparatively late date.⁴⁷ There is no proof that they occupied any other part of Mesopotamian Subartu in early times. To be sure, bearers of Hurrian names had filtered into the country in the third millennium. Here and there they may have played important parts in the history of the land. But the home of the people must be sought elsewhere; northern Mesopotamia was to them an adopted land, which they overran in the course of an extensive migration at the beginning of the second millennium, certainly not much earlier.

It follows, therefore, that the Subareans are not the people that some scholars have taken them to be. They cannot be equated with the Hurrians of the Boghazköi texts, or with their Syrian relatives. We do not know whether the early Akkadians and Babylonians had a special ethnic designation for the Hurrians, nor, if so, what it was. It is a fact that later Assyrian kings referred to the Hurrians by the newly coined term *šubari*. But this did not take place until the Hurrians had been in the country for centuries. It is a not unusual instance of modifying an old native name for the purpose of applying it, in a specialized sense, to a now largely assimilated people.⁴⁸ But we cannot employ such a name indiscriminately for all the branches of that ethnic group without wholly obscuring the historical background.

With the disputes about terminology thus terminated at long last, we may now address ourselves to more productive tasks. Having come finally to an

⁴⁷ On this point *Mesop. Orig.*, ch. V, is now subject to correction. Leaving aside the question of the population of the district in prehistoric times, we know now that the Hurrians as such supplanted other ethnic elements, though these too were largely "Asiatic," or "Japhethite." But the language of the pre-Hurrian texts from Arrapha shows that Semitic cultural influences were strong in the third millennium. A similar chronological argument against equating Subaru with Hurri is brought up by Götze, *ZA*, NF. VII, 244. On the basis of the records from Boghazköi, reinforced with valid archaeological arguments, Götze places the Hurrian migration after 1900 B. C.

⁴⁸ Somewhat similarly, the name Canaan, applied to a land which supported at one time a non-Semitic population (to judge from the place-names of the third millennium, or, for that matter, from the lists of "Canaanites" in the Old Testament), developed into a designation for the later Semitic inhabitants of the land and for their language. But in that case a convenient rival term was lacking. On the other hand, quite apart from the incorrectness of the Assyrian term, Hurri was actually in general use. To speak of Subareans in Palestine and in Egypt, as is sometimes done, is incongruous, to say the least, especially in view of the attested biblical *ḥōrī* and Egyptian *ḥuru*. But we are anticipating.

agreement concerning the status of Hurri, the inquiry must now be switched back to the Hurrians. It will be found expedient to review first the known extent of their diffusion in the Near East. From the Boghazköi archives we have learned that Hurrians flanked the Hittite empire to the southeast. The Amarna records bear ample witness to their expansion in Syria: Hurrian glosses and proper names serve to locate the people in such centers as Aleppo, Tunip, and Qatna, while the letter of Tushratta establishes Hurrian as the official language of the kingdom of Mitanni. Farther east we have the valuable evidence from Hurrian names in Babylonia and Assyria; lastly, the eloquent testimony of the Nuzi texts bespeaks extensive settlements in the region east of the Tigris.

Brilliant corroborative evidence of Hurrian influence in Syria has come recently from Ras Shamra. The finds from that North Syrian site have helped to make history in more ways than one. Most scholars have been attracted, naturally enough, to the new Semitic texts with their unique alphabetic script, because these records have an obvious bearing on pre-biblical history. That Hurri (*ḥri*) is mentioned in these documents need scarcely cause us any surprise.⁴⁹ In the excitement caused by these discoveries many may have overlooked, however, the fact that Ras Shamra has yielded also other texts written in the ordinary cuneiform script. Among the languages that are thus represented are included Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hurrian; in the light of the preceding remarks the occurrence of the latter is especially significant. Sumerian and Akkadian were inevitable as the international literary media of the period. But the inclusion of Hurrian texts cannot be attributed to similar causes; instead, we have here clear proof that, by the side of Semitic, Hurrian was actually spoken in the district. Welcome confirmation on this point is furnished by the Sumero-Hurrian vocabularies from Ras Shamra, which are now available in the masterly publication of Thureau-Dangin.⁵⁰

Nor was Syria the southern-most outpost of the Hurrians along the Mediterranean coast; Palestine, too, must now be added to the list. Conclusive proof to this effect is furnished by the tablets from Ta'anek, near Megiddo, which contain a substantial proportion of Hurrian proper names.⁵¹ With this important evidence the whole problem of the biblical Horites comes again to the fore.

Hebrew *hōrî*, "Horite," has been responsible for nearly as many compli-

⁴⁹ See above, notes 30 and 42.

⁵⁰ Cf. note 9.

⁵¹ See Gustavs, "Die Personennamen in den Tontafeln von Tell Ta'anek," *ZDPV*, vol. L, pp. 7 ff.

cations as Hurri: in many respects the careers of both terms show a remarkable parallelism. Until recently the name was linked with Hebrew *hōr*, "hole, cave:" the Horites were, accordingly, "cave-dwellers" and nothing else. This etymology met with little opposition so long as the Horites were supposed to have been confined to the mountain districts of Edom.⁵² But at length that people refused to be satisfied with such limited territory. Through the insight of Eduard Meyer it became apparent that the Horites may have played originally a far more important part than the present text of the Bible would lead us to suspect.⁵³ Beginning with the New Kingdom, Egyptian sources refer to Palestine by a name that is conventionally vocalized as *Haru*; it should, however, be read *Huru*, as was suggested by W. Max Müller forty years ago.⁵⁴ What prevented Müller from connecting *Huru* with the Horites was the accepted etymology of the latter; how could all of *Huru* be called "cave-land," and its people "cave-dwellers"?⁵⁵ But Meyer was not handicapped by such considerations. Having found adequate reasons for seeing in the Horites an originally wide-spread group, he promptly threw the etymology overboard and combined the Hebrew and Egyptian designations, thus obtaining in the common term an early synonym for "Canaanites."⁵⁶ He rejected, on the other hand, Winckler's further combination of *Huru-Hori* with the northern Hurri (Winckler read *Haru*, *Harri* = Aryans) on the ground that the Horite genealogies contain names which are clearly Semitic, and not Indo-European or Mitannian.⁵⁷

The last argument, however, is not necessarily conclusive. The Nuzi records show, as we were able to point out in our first paper on the subject,⁵⁸ that the Hurrians readily submitted to semitization even in such predominantly Hur-

⁵² Cf. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 136 f.

⁵³ *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 330 ff.

⁵⁴ *Op. cit.*, 155. Professor Albright was good enough to inform me that, according to his studies of Egyptian syllabic writing, the first syllable of the name may be read as *hu*. And lastly, Ranke has shown (*Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation*, 15, 17) that the proper name of the Amarna letters which occurs as Puḥur, Puḥura, Paḥura, and the like, evidently represents Egyptian *P3-ḥr* "the *Huru*, Syrian." The cuneiform writing leaves, of course, no doubt as to the reading *hu*.

⁵⁵ *Asien und Europa*, 155 f.

⁵⁶ It is so used in his *Geschichte* (1931), vol. II. 2, p. 157. Perhaps the most interesting item in support of this contention is found by Meyer (*Isr. u. Nach.*, 336) in Isa. 17. 9 where Heb. has the impossible הַרְרִישׁ וְהַאֲמִיר. The Septuagint makes better sense with its "Hiwwite and Amorite," but "Horite and Amorite" is closer to the original text. Here we would have, then, an interesting parallel to "Canaanite and Amorite." For the frequent substitution of Hiwwite for Horite see below.

⁵⁷ *Geschichte* II. 1, p. 6, n. 3.

⁵⁸ ANNUAL VI, 81.

rian areas as contemporary Arrapha. It was not uncommon for persons with perfectly good Hurrian names to call their sons by Akkadian equivalents. Since that paper was written (1926), many more instances of the same tendency have come to light.⁵⁹ This condition prevailed in the 16th and 15th centuries (average date of the Nuzi tablets); it is natural, therefore, that it should be reflected, with local variations, in the book of Genesis, at a time when the presence of Hurrians in the land had long ceased to be anything else than a shadowy tradition. We have seen that distinctive Hurrian names were not uncommon in Canaan in the Amarna age;⁶⁰ Palestinian sites have yielded also other Hurrian analogues of the same general period.⁶¹ Moreover, at the time in question the country was known as *Ḫuru* to the Egyptians, a name which corresponds phonetically not only with the biblical *Ḫōrī*, but also with the cuneiform *Ḫurri*; this correspondence is made complete by the Septuagint rendering *Χορραῖος*.⁶² The equation of *Ḫuru-Ḫōrī* with

⁵⁹ Among the examples in *HSS V*, the following few may be listed: A good Hurrian by the name of Tayuki (wr. *ta-a-ú-ki*, *ta-a-a-ú-ki*, *ta-i-ú-ki*, etc.) has a son called Ilanu (wr. *i-la-a-nu*, *DINGIR-a-nu*, *DINGIR-nu*), 4. 5-6; 13. 9-10; 38. 6, e. al.; he in turn is the father of Ilmahī (wr. *i-li-ma-šeš*, *DINGIR-ma-ḫi*, etc.), 9. 7; 15. 8; 36. 3, e. al. Another Nuzian with the typically Hurrian name of Akkulenni has a sister Bēlit-Akkadi-ummi (for interesting variants in the spelling of this latter name cf. 25. 4, 8, 11; 69. 3, 8). Conversely, a man bearing the Semitic name Bil-Adad (so in 3. 5; etymologically it is Apil-Adad, 76. 11, evidently the prototype of the biblical Bildad) is the father of the Hurrian Puhiya (hypocor. for Puhi-senni). Similarly, Tarmiya is the son of Gimil-Adad (wr. *ki-mi-il-la-ta*), *HSS IX*, 100. 39. The linguistic origin of their names was apparently a matter of minor importance with the Hurrians. For an interesting sidelight on this question cf. *Mesop. Orig.*, 114. The Egyptian name of the Hyksos Apepi (Apophis) furnishes an instructive analogon of the same category.

⁶⁰ See above, note 51.

⁶¹ This is not the place to enter into the absorbing details of the problem. Fortunately, the reader can now be referred to Albright's exhaustive studies of contemporary pottery found in Palestinian sites, and of the ultimate origin of these wares; see especially, *ANNUAL XII*, chapters II-III, and the present volume, §§ 13 ff. It is clear that whereas the pottery of Middle Bronze I shows parallels with Billa 4 (*Museum Journal XXIII*, 270-273, and plates lvi-lxix, lxxii), Middle Bronze II contains analogues of Billa 3 (*ibid.*, 273 ff., and plates lx-lxiv). Now Billa 3 is Hurrian proper, Billa 4 pre-Hurrian. Or in terms of archaeological interrelations, the third stratum of Billa shows intimate connections with the west, i. e., with Mycenaean centers, while Billa 4 is primarily Asiatic. The two are reflected in the earlier and later Hyksos strata respectively. It is too early to determine with precision what bearing these facts may have on the Hyksos problem. For the diffusion of Hurrian sculptural material cf. Moortgat, *ZA*, NF. VII, 209 ff.

⁶² Cf. *Mesop. Orig.*, 132; Sommer, *Aḥḫijavā*, 285. Since a double *r* can be rendered neither in the Hebrew nor in the Egyptian scripts, *ḫōrī* and *ḫur(u)* are the closest

Hurri⁶³ becomes thus unavoidable. There is little need to indicate what such an equation implies from a historical standpoint.

One last possible objection remains to be met: thus far we have had no proof, but only a mere assumption, that the Horites really occupied larger areas than are allowed them by the Bible; if they are indeed the same as the Hurrians, they must be discovered outside of Edom. These misgivings will disappear upon a closer examination of the biblical material. It can be shown that the present evidence for Horite concentration in Edom rests largely on erroneous textual transmission; earlier versions pictured a different situation. The Septuagint knew of Horites living in Central Palestine, to judge from two important passages where we have *Xoppaio*— for the חִי of the present Hebrew text.⁶⁴ That this interchange is not merely a matter of the Greek recension as against Hebrew, but occurs within the Hebrew itself, is made evident by Gen. 36, where verse 2 reads חִי, while verse 20 has חִרִי, although both refer to the same family. In point of fact, the Hiwwites (E. V. "Hivites") have had a very precarious existence throughout. In two significant instances they were refused recognition by the Septuagint, as we have just seen. There are only two other passages in which the Hiwwites are associated with more or less definite localities: Jos. 11. 3 would place them "under Hermon in the land of Miṣpah," and Jud. 3. 3 locates them in Mount Lebanon. This time objections are raised by the commentators, who substitute "Hittites" in both cases, with the Greek lending its authority to this change as far as the passage in Jos. is concerned.⁶⁵ The difficulty is obvious: first we encounter the Hiwwites in Central Palestine; the Septuagint brands them as disguised Horites. Then we are introduced to them in southern Syria; now the commentators offer strenuous opposition, saying that they have room for the Hittites, but have never heard of Hiwwites so far north. Outside of the above passages the Hiwwites are found only in the stereotyped, and for our purposes mean-

possible approximations to *hurri*. The Septuagint rendering restores the double *r*, and the *o*-vowel is a normal inner-Hebrew development before a long consonant. In transcribing *hōri* (with a long *o*) we are indicating the regular compensatory lengthening of the vowel in Hebrew.

⁶³ In his valuable *Untersuchungen zur alten Geschichte und Ethnographie Syriens und Palästinas*, 34, n. 4, Maisler gives this chain a rather novel turn. He approves the connection of Hurri with Huru, but rules out the intermediate link of the Horites. The stumbling block in his case is the alleged Bedouin character of the Horites. The answer is that the thoroughly semitized and disguised Horites of the biblical documents are a long way off from the original Hurri.

⁶⁴ Gen. 34. 2; Jos. 9. 7 (13 in the Greek version). The third relevant passage (Jos. 11. 19) is not represented at all by the Septuagint; cf. *Mesop. Orig.*, 132.

⁶⁵ Cf. Burney, *Judges*, ad loc.

ingless, lists of Canaanite races.⁶⁶ In not a single instance where the mention of the Hiwwites is of any significance may the reference be considered unassailable. It is logical to ask, therefore, whether such a people as the Hiwwites ever had a tangible existence. A negative answer will be fully justified, if we are able to produce the group that can take their place. For this we do not have to go very far. Both the Septuagint and the Masoretic text have proposed the Horites as a partial solution. We cannot do better than apply this remedy to the remaining cases. The Hurrian names from Ta'anek bear out the Greek recension admirably; there is now also ample evidence for the presence of Hurrians in Syria. When the commentators summoned the Hittites to their aid, a good deal was known about "Hittite" Qadesh, but next to nothing as regards the diffusion of the Hurrians. Today we are able not only to connect the Hurrians with the Horites, but also to combine the latter with the Hiwwites.

Was חַוִּי , then, a textual error for חַרִּי pure and simple? It may have been that, as is made probable by Gen. 36. 2 and 20. Hebrew ח and ח are readily confused, whether the script be Phoenician or Aramaic. Once perpetrated, the mistake would extend rapidly to other occurrences of the name. It is even possible to discover a reason for the popularity of the spurious Hiwwites. That popular etymology relegated the Horites to caves at an early time is a very probable assumption. In that case Edom was an ideal home, but Palestine as a whole was far less suitable; thus the Horites came to be restricted to Edom and the Hiwwites were substituted for them in all their other scheduled appearances. All this, however, is only a hypothesis. Possible is also the assumption of a Horite subdivision known as the Hiwwites, whose name supplanted the more general designation on account of complications arising through popular etymology.⁶⁷ But the precise sequence of events

⁶⁶ The Septuagint has an additional Εὐαίοι in Isa. 17. 9, a passage that is badly mutilated in Hebrew. But the ethnic group in this case were undoubtedly the Horites, cf. note 56.

⁶⁷ A Hurrian clan of Hawites, or the like, is a distinct possibility, especially in view of the well known Hurrian name Hu(w)ya (wr. hu-ia, *HSS* V. 92. 13, and hu-ú-ia). This substitution of a part for the whole would have been facilitated by the influences mentioned above. The transfer may also have been suggested by the analogy with another, but similar name. To be more specific, Deut. 2. 23 (and Jos. 13. 3) speaks of the 'Awwim who dwell in enclosures (חֲצֵרִים); they were supplanted by the Cretans "that came forth out of Caphtor." The passage was discussed by Albright in *JPOS* I, 187 ff. Albright has also paved the way for the next step, by his brilliant discussions of the peculiar Hyksos ramparts (identified by him as such); for latest references cf. *Bulletin* 47, p. 8. Now these enclosures in which the 'Awwim dwelt can hardly be anything else than the Hyksos ramparts. The people are relegated to the

is really a matter of little concern in this particular instance. The Hiwmites have been proved guilty of removing Horite landmarks. The wrong having been corrected, we need not be too reflective about the original motives.

It will be granted, I think, that the equation of Hurrians with Horites may now be viewed as safely established. With the last link in a long chain thus in position, this part of the inquiry has been completed. The results may be summed up briefly, as follows: 1. During the second millennium we see extensive sections of the Near East occupied by a new ethnic group. 2. As a designation for that people, and its characteristic language, *Subarean* is not merely inferior to *Hurrian*; on latest evidence it is demonstrably incorrect.⁶⁸ 3. The penetration of the Hurrians into Palestine is established through the independent evidence of proper names; it is reflected in Egyptian *Huru* and in the biblical sources dealing with the Horites.

We may now consider some of the resultant historical implications.

III. The Hurrians in the Light of Contemporary History.

Perhaps the most striking feature in connection with the Hurrians is the established fact of their expansion over a vast area, in what was assumed by many to have been predominantly Semitic territory. The scholarly world, which has watched these developments with an increasing sense of wonder, cannot but find the rise of the Hurrians an even more remarkable phenomenon than the re-appearance of the Hittites. For the latter we were prepared to a certain extent by Egyptian, biblical, and cuneiform sources. But the same records contained no warning that we should be obliged to make room for the

Negeb, where such fortifications have already been discovered (at Tell el-Fâr'ah; cf. also the Hyksos material from Tell el-'Ajûl). Moreover, the chronological indications, according to which Cretans followed the 'Awwîm, correspond with the archaeological sequence of Hyksos and Aegean influences. And lastly, Prof. Olmstead, with whom I have discussed this point, reminds me of the Hyksos center in Galilee, the celebrated Hazor, whose name is formed from the very root employed to designate the "enclosures." In short, the 'Awwîm represented a Hyksos group. Since the period involved dovetails with the time of the Hurrian diffusion in Palestine, it is entirely probable that the 'Awwîm were not without influence on the Hiwmites, at least through being associated with them by later writers. The point should be borne in mind, even though nothing more than the form of the latter name may be at stake.

⁶⁸ In dealing with the purely linguistic aspect of the problem, the impression must not be created that there were no dialectic differences within Hurrian. Local peculiarities have been noted, by others as well as by the present writer (cf. *JAOS* 49, 269 ff.). But instead of speaking of Hurrian in one place and of Subarean elsewhere, it is much less confusing, and more direct, to indicate in each particular instance that we are dealing with the Hurrian of Boghazköi, Ras esh-Shamra, Mitanni, Nuzi, etc.

Hurrians, by whatever name they might be known, outside and far beyond the limits of the middle Euphrates area. Near Eastern history is still young enough for such startling surprises.

Apart from the spatial aspect, however, there is a further factor in this study which is of equal scientific importance: the chronological element involved. We have seen that the mass movement of Hurrians into Arrapha took place in the first half of the second millennium; the same applies to the district of Nineveh (Tell Billa). In Mesopotamia, then, the scattered and sporadic visitors of an earlier age, who bear Hurrian names, are followed in the Cassite period by large groups of Hurrian settlers. The west fared similarly in this respect. The Palestinian Hurrians of the middle of the second millennium cannot lay claim in that country to very high antiquity. For the Egyptian records of about 2000 B. C. which are capable of throwing some light on this subject (commonly cited as *Aechtungstexte*) allow us to infer that Palestine and Phoenicia were overwhelmingly Semitic as late as the end of the Middle Kingdom.⁶⁹ Now a movement that deposited large groups of an intrusive ethnic stock in such widely separated areas as Arrapha and Palestine, as well as in the intermediate districts, cannot be classed simply with wanderings in the ordinary sense of the term. We have here evidence of ethnic migrations on an unprecedented scale, which changed completely the political map of the Near East and brought in their wake radical ethnic realignments. It is the dynamic character of these happenings that, combined with their narrow chronological limitations, gives them such a prominent place in the history of the second millennium.

At this point it becomes advisable to guard against possible confusion with regard to a rather important detail. It has been indicated that the Hurrian migrations belong in their entirety to the second millennium, and that upon overrunning the new territories the Hurrians faced for the most part populations of Semitic or semitized stock. In other words, Semites had preceded the Hurrians in the regions with which we are concerned. Now it would be fallacious to base upon this fact the conclusion that the Semites really constituted the earliest ethnic group in the areas under discussion, at least within historic times. We know, in fact, that such was not the case. In Palestine place names of the Early Bronze age testify to the early occupation of the

⁶⁹ For this exceedingly important material see Sethe, *Die Aechtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefässcherben des Mittleren Reiches*, Berlin, 1926. The Asiatic references in these texts have been discussed by several scholars; see especially Albright, "The Egyptian Empire in Asia in the Twenty-First Century B. C.," *JPOS* VIII, 223 ff.

country on the part of non-Semitic elements; the same may be said of Syria.⁷⁰ Mesopotamia was, of course, the proverbial Babel; Sumerians and Semites, plainsmen and mountaineers, waged unending wars for the possession of the fertile valley. This was the situation during the best part of the third millennium.⁷¹ But it is a different world that confronts us in the succeeding period. There had been centuries of comparative quiet about the turn of the millennium: the golden ages of Hammurabi and of the Twelfth Dynasty of Egypt. Hither Asia had acquired in the meantime a veneer of racial equilibrium, with the Semites holding the balance of power. And then the storm broke loose.

It is not within the compass of this essay, much less within the competence of its author, to trace the ensuing events to their possible ultimate causes. To locate the original force that was soon to start an avalanche sweeping everything before it; uprooting peoples here and depositing them far from their original seats; driving Indo-Europeans into Anatolia and Cassites to the heart of Babylonia, with a powerful wedge of Hurrians in between; a force that abated long enough to permit the feeble amenities of the Amarna age, only to blaze another trail of destruction in annihilating empires and sending wave upon wave of Peoples of the Sea against the shores of the Mediterranean; all this presents an awesome task which is today as fascinating as it is dangerous.⁷² Our sole concern for the present is with one of the stages in this upheaval: the vicissitudes of the Hurrians. By bearing in mind the course of their migrations, and by restricting ourselves to the implied limits of space and of time, we shall succeed in reducing greatly the magnitude of the problem as a whole. Nevertheless, there remain many pitfalls and hazards. To venture out in these circumstances will be hardly accounted the better part of valor; and it is a poor consolation to know that others have done it, and suffered the consequences.

We have seen that the Hurrians were wanderers, from necessity rather than by choice. We have met them in Mesopotamia and in Syria, in Palestine and at the borders of Egypt. Furthermore, we have been able to restrict the time of their wanderings to a portion of the second millennium. Thus far we have stayed on fairly safe ground. With the next step our troubles begin in earnest; but that step cannot be avoided. For now we must confront the Hurrians with their fellow-wanderers, the *Ḫabiru* and the *Hyksos*.

The last two terms are not strictly of the same type. Neither is precise,

⁷⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 254; cf. also *Mesop. Orig.*, p. 154, n. 113.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

⁷² Götze, *Das Hethiter-Reich*, 13, appreciates both the nature and the magnitude of the problem.

but one is much more general and vague than the other. Ḫabiru starts out as an appellative,⁷³ but it has the ambition and a decided tendency to develop into an ethnic designation; Hyksos does not cease to be an appellative until it is removed by late writers to a semi-mythological sphere.⁷⁴ The difference between the two may not be immediately apparent; it is none the less considerable. Ḫabiru comes to designate a fairly well defined entity, which may be contrasted with such other entities as Hurrian, Hittite, or even Amorite. Hyksos, on the other hand, means simply "rulers of the foreign lands;" it may stand for Hurrian, Hittite, Amorite, and the like, not barring Ḫabiru. In short, the two terms are not mutually exclusive.

There have been many studies on the subject of the Ḫabiru, some of them of outstanding merit.⁷⁵ If they have failed to prove altogether conclusive, it is only because the available material does not admit as yet of a satisfactory solution of the problem. There is now neither the need nor the necessary space to go into all the details of this intricate subject; it will suffice to bring out the salient facts and to attempt to reduce the material to a common denominator.

There is a great deal of similarity between the careers of the Hurri and the Ḫabiru. In Babylonia we find the Ḫabiru in pre-Hammurabi times.⁷⁶ East of the Tigris they are amply attested at Nuzi, where we find a welcome abundance of proper names of the Ḫabiru.⁷⁷ They were known in Cappadocia,⁷⁸ and in the Boghazköi texts they figure very prominently.⁷⁹ The Amarna tablets are particularly sensitive to the Ḫabiru menace.⁸⁰ And to make this parallelism complete, they were not strangers to Egypt, as we shall see presently.

Hurrians and Ḫabiru were thus coextensive to a remarkable degree; apart from this, however, their paths diverge sharply. The Hurrians can always

⁷³ See Landsberger, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*, 321 ff.; Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, 206 f.; Olmstead, *History of Palestine and Syria*, 158 ff.; Chiera, *AJSL* XLIX, 115 ff.; for older material on the subject cf. *Mesop. Orig.*, 162, n. 126, Burney, *Judges*, lxxiii ff.

⁷⁴ Cf. W. Wolf, "Der Stand der Hyksosfrage," *ZDMG* 83, pp. 67 ff.

⁷⁵ Jirku, *Die Wanderungen der Hebräer*, glosses over too many of the real difficulties, although his collection of the extra-biblical references was valuable at the time when his pamphlet was published (1924).

⁷⁶ Cf. *RA* XII, 115.

⁷⁷ Chiera, *loc. cit.* Incidentally, the Nuzi texts make it clear that the name was originally *Ḫabiru* in the sg., *Ḫabirū* in the pl.; *Ḫabiri* is a later collective designation.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁷⁹ See provisionally Forrer, *Reallex. d. Assy.* I, 235; Sommer, *Aḥḫijavā*, 43 f.

⁸⁰ Knudtzon, *Amarna*, 1574 f.; Thureau-Dangin, *RA* XIX, 98 ff.

be recognized by their characteristic proper names: they were an ethnic unit. But the Ḫabiru cannot be identified in the same simple manner, because their names belong to a variety of languages: the people were obviously recruited from various ethnic groups.⁸¹ We cannot tell a Ḫabiru unless he has been called so specifically; the name is therefore merely an appellative.

If Ḫabiru was not a racial term, what other idea did the name convey? Was the designation occupational? The reported functions of the people are too diverse for that. For they were employed as professional soldiers, laborers, or simply slaves; in the Amarna period they represent independent units.⁸² This being the case, the name must denote in some way the status of the group concerned. What, then, was the common characteristic of all the Ḫabiru?

We must examine briefly the available sources. The Nuzi records, which throw so much light on contemporary social conditions, will be the first to claim our attention. It is fortunate indeed that the numerous references to the Ḫabiru which are found in these documents are now gathered conveniently in an important study by Chiera (*loc. cit.*), the last one from the pen of that lamented scholar. Upon a closer examination, the proper names will be found inconclusive, although they represent the bulk of the onomastic material bearing on the Ḫabiru; for they are composed largely of Babylonian and Assyrian elements, and non-Semitic compounds are not rare. For ethnic purposes, therefore, the material is useful only in a negative sense. The same is true of the geographical indications; the people are often traced to the places of their origin, but the countries in question range from Akkad to Assyria and the more westerly Izalla.⁸³ The Ḫabiru of Arrapha have only one thing in common: they do not enjoy full civic rights. The tablets in which they are mentioned are usually records of self-enslavement, whereby the Ḫabiru enter "of their own free will" into such and such a household for servitude. To be sure, there is a legal difference between these free-born servants and slaves proper: the former could regain their original status upon making the necessary payments. The fact remains, however, that the Ḫabiru of Arrapha were generally compelled by the force of circumstances to forfeit their freedom.

What were these circumstances? Any answer to this question will be open to dispute so long as the sources remain incomplete. For the present we are reduced to more or less justified deductions, not to say conjectures. No explanation can be considered, however, unless it satisfies one essential prerequisite:

⁸¹ Cf. Burney, *Judges*, lxxx, and the list in Chiera, *loc. cit.*, 117. For the connection between Ḫabiru and SA.GAS, see now Landsberger, *loc. cit.*, 322; on the whole question cf. also Dhorme, *JPOS* IV, 162 ff., and J. Lewy, *OLZ*, 1927, cols. 738 ff.

⁸² Cf. Chiera, *loc. cit.*

⁸³ Wr. (*mât*) *in-za-al-ti*, *ibid.*, 118.

it must apply to all the known occurrences of the Ḫabiru. We cannot devise at this stage one set of rules for the Palestinian Ḫabiru and another one for their Nuzian contemporaries.

The first step towards such an explanation is quite simple. Wherever they are encountered, the Ḫabiru are evidently foreigners. In the west they are not Hittites or Canaanites, in the east they cannot be classed with the citizens of Arrapha or of Babylon.⁸⁴ They are men without a country, either as expatriates or because no country had ever claimed them as citizens. They are strangers and, as such, nomads in a certain sense.

How did the Ḫabiru come by such a mode of life? On this point there are marked differences of opinion. A review of these would carry us too far afield. We shall mention only two or three of the latest theories. According to Chiera they were recruited from among captives. This might account for their social status in Arrapha, but it will not work elsewhere. In Babylonian records the Ḫabiru are supervised by officers of their own,⁸⁵ which does not seem normal for captives. The Hittites employ them for military purposes, and in Syria and Palestine they appear as independent raiders. These facts can scarcely be reconciled with the captive theory.⁸⁶ Others have thought of the Ḫabiru as foreign soldiers;⁸⁷ but they certainly fail to strike us as mercenaries in Nuzi. The best view seems to be that the Ḫabiru consisted of bands of adventurers and soldiers of fortune.⁸⁸ In peaceful times it would not have been an easy matter for them to subsist on raids in such well organized states as Babylon or Arrapha. They had to take such work as they could find, even if it involved virtual slavery. We cannot blame the Nuzians for failing to welcome them with open arms or for not extending to them the privileges of citizens. On the other hand, such groups would naturally thrive on wars. Having little to lose, they would offer their aid to the highest bidder, and there were apparently many Asiatic princes in the troubled years of the pre-Amarna period who could use their services to good advantage; few could afford to antagonize them.⁸⁹ The power of the early kings of the Eight-

⁸⁴ When a good Hurrian name, such as Nan-Teshup, is found among the Ḫabiru of Nuzi (*ibid.*, 117), we must conclude that the man was not a citizen, although a Hurrian, because he is treated exactly like the other Ḫabiru.

⁸⁵ They have their PA.LÚ.SA.GAZ.MEŠ (VAB VI, no. 26), just as the Amorites have their PA.MAR.TU (cf. *Reallex. d. Assy.* I, 447).

⁸⁶ In the Amarna letters (Knudtzon, 287.54; 288.21) the word for captives (*asirû*, *asiri*) occurs in the same texts as the Ḫabiru, but the two groups are never confused.

⁸⁷ Cf. Jirku, *op. cit.*

⁸⁸ Landsberger, *loc. cit.*; Albright, *Archaeology*, 208.

⁸⁹ See the comprehensive account in Olmstead, *Palestine*, 158 ff.

eenth Dynasty may have put a temporary check upon their activities; but with the decline of that dynasty the Ḫabiru were back at their old game, with Syria and Palestine offering unusual opportunities for success.

This interpretation commends itself now to an increasing number of scholars because it is capable of accounting for the varying fortunes of the Ḫabiru in peace and war. According to this view, a Ḫabiru was at first not necessarily one who belonged to a given ethnic group or who hailed from a specified locality, but rather one who was committed to a certain particular mode of living. We have had occasion to see that it was by no means a sedentary life. It would naturally appeal more to nomads than to dwellers in towns and villages. In fact, the whole movement may have received its original impetus from wandering Semitic tribesmen. But the Ḫabiru cannot be equated simply with the Bedouin; they constituted broader social groups, with followers from the various countries through which they had passed. Perhaps it is wisest not to probe too closely into the antecedents of these recruits from the ranks of the settled population; their motives need not have been strictly honorable.⁹⁰ At any rate, the synonym *ḫabbatu* "raider" for Ḫabiru was no doubt well justified.⁹¹ The nature of their various pursuits evidently called for strict organization. In the course of time a certain degree of ethnic consciousness may have developed secondarily. Thus, e. g., when a group embarked upon a raid and reinforcements became necessary, an Aramaic majority within that group might welcome additional Arameans, or even Amorites, rather than Hittites or Hurrians. Along the same lines there may have evolved specifically Ḫabiru religious concepts,⁹² namely by adoption from a given group and subsequent specialization.

But enough of these speculations! We are in danger of wandering off farther than the most nomadic of the Ḫabiru. Time will tell how much reason there may be in such suggestions. In the meantime it will be safer to follow the Ḫabiru into Egypt. There is no longer any serious doubt about the correctness of identifying the Ḫabiru with the Egyptian 'Apiru. The latter appear as foreign laborers, perhaps also as mercenaries, in the records of the Ramessides of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties (Ramesses II-Ramesses IV, 13th and 12th centuries). The identity of the two terms was doubted largely because of the disparity in time: the Ḫabiru of the Amarna

⁹⁰ While the Ḫabiru movement would appeal naturally to nomadic groups of Semites, it was scarcely equally attractive to the settled Kassites and Hurrians. It is fugitives from justice who often find a refuge in such "foreign legions."

⁹¹ Cf. Landsberger, *loc. cit.*, 322.

⁹² On the *ilāni Ḫabiri* see now Landsberger, *ibid.*, 326.

records appear a century earlier than the 'Apiru. Moreover, there was little outward similarity between the dangerous warriors of the cuneiform documents and the workmen employed by Ramesses II for the performance of menial tasks. We know now, however, from the Nuzi records that not all the Ḫabiru were proud conquerors. In reality, the lot of their Nuzian confrères was scarcely more enviable than that of the most overworked 'Apiru. Finally, the 'Apiru have been found recently in Palestine, in the stele of Sethos I, hence prior to their previous earliest appearance under Ramesses II, and no further in time from the Ḫabiru of the Amarna documents than the related material from Nuzi. The connection of the 'Apiru with the Ḫabiru may thus be considered as reasonably complete.⁹³

⁹³ This formerly rejected connection is now gaining general acceptance; cf., e.g., Jirku, *op. cit.*, 23 ff., Bilabel, *Geschichte*, 120, 428, and Albright, *loc. cit.* Mr. Battiscombe Gunn, Curator of the Egyptian section of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, who was good enough to read the manuscript and proof of this paper and make several valuable suggestions, kindly appends the following note on the subject:

"In all six occurrences of the name "Apiru" or "Aperiu" are known to me, namely:

- (1) 'pr : Beth-shan Stela of Sethos I, see Alan Rowe, *The Topography and History of Beth Shan*, 30.
- (2) 'pr : Harris Papyrus 500, verso 1/5 (*temp.* Sethos I or slightly later).
- (3) 'prjw : Leyden Papyrus I, 348, 6/6 (*temp.* Ramesses II).
- (4) 'prw : Leyden Papyrus I, 349 (b), line 7 (*temp.* Ramesses II).
- (5) 'pr : Great Harris Papyrus, 31/8 (*temp.* Ramesses III).
- (6) 'pr : Couyat-Montet, *Inscriptions . . . du Ouâdi Hammâmât*, No. 12/17 (*temp.* Ramesses IV).

In these writings of the word, the only consonants that concern us are ' , *p* and *r*; the final *w* in (4) is doubtless merely the Egyptian masculine plural ending, and the *jw* of (3) seems to be another form of the Egyptian masculine plural, much less common, peculiar to Late Egyptian and obscure in origin; it is also found occasionally in the plural form Ḫrjw "Ḫurrians", see Erman-Gradow, *Aeg. Wörterbuch*, 3, 232. It is quite possible that the *p* of this word represented a foreign *b*, for a number of similar cases are known: (a) *isbr* varying with *ispr*, "whip", from an unknown foreign word. Burchardt, *Die altkanaanäischen Fremdwörter* II, 134; (b) *hrp* "sword" = Hebr. חרב, and cf. Arabic *ḥrb*, *op. cit.*, 686; (c) *špr* = *šubbilulī(uma)*, name of Hittite king, *op. cit.*, 776; (d) *kpn* (in the Old Kingdom *kbn*) = *gubla*, "Byblos", *op. cit.*, 975, 970; (e) *grb* varying with *grp*, an unknown foreign word of uncertain meaning, *op. cit.*, 1059, 1061; (f) *tpn*, Syrian place-name = Hebr. *Dibôn?*, *op. cit.*, 1085, and (g) *dpr*, Syrian place-name = Hebr. *Deḫîr*, *op. cit.*, 1186.

"It is perhaps no mere coincidence that in six out of these seven cases the *p/b* has *r* or *l* either before or after it, while also the *p* in 'pr is followed by *r*. And the one exception (f) may really be eliminated from the list, for the identification with *Dibôn* is quite doubtful. In (b) and (d) *rb*, *bl* seem to have been contiguous in the words heard by the Egyptians (*ḥarbu*, *gubla*); in (c) and (g) *bl*, *br* were separated by short *i* and long *i* respectively; of the vocalization of (a) and (e) we know nothing.

The Egyptian synonym helps to settle a troublesome problem in phonology. As is well known, cuneiform *ḥ* may represent Semitic *ḥ* and *ghayin*, as well as West-Semitic *ʿayin*.⁹⁴ Which of these three sounds is concealed in the first consonant of *ḥabiru*? The question has an obvious bearing upon the etymology of the name. In the Egyptian writing the above consonants are not subject to the same confusion as in cuneiform; hence *ʿApiru* compels us to decide definitely in favor of *ʿayin*. This is a very useful development because it precludes further combinations of *Ḥabiru* with Heb. *ḥbr* and the consequent interpretation of the term as "confederates." Unfortunately, the second consonant in the case is not treated with the same consideration. The cuneiform writing may represent a *b* or a *p*; the Egyptian form has indeed *p*, but this is not decisive because *b* has been known to lose its voice in Egyptian

Although there are many cases (36 counted) in which a foreign *b* with *r* or *l* either before or after it is represented by *b* and not by *p* in the Egyptian writings, the fact that in the word *ʿpr* the *p* is followed by *r* surely makes it easier to regard it as representing an original *ʿbr*.

"It remains, as regards the consonants, to be pointed out that no case is known in which the Egyptians wrote a foreign *ḥ* or *ḥ* by *ʿ*, so that of the two words (or forms) *ʿbr* ("Hebrew") and *Ḥabiru* it can have been only the former that was reproduced as *ʿpr*.

"The vocalization of *ʿpr* cannot at present be ascertained precisely from the Egyptian writings. The writing of the first consonant is that which seems to stand regularly for *ʿa-* at the beginnings of other foreign words. The second element is written in (2, 3, 5) with a group which elsewhere seems to represent indifferently *pa*, *pi* or *pu*; in (4, 6) there is no indication of any vowel; in (1) the vowel *i* is possibly indicated. The third, *r*-element is written in (2, 3, 5) as though closing a syllable, but in (4, 6), and perhaps in (1) without any indication as to vocalic context. Thus we seem to have the alternatives *ʿapar*, *ʿapir*, *ʿapur*, with a possible indication in (1) in favor of *ʿapir*; plus, in (3, 4), an Egyptian plural ending. B. G."

While acknowledging gratefully my obligation to Curator Gunn, I wish also to express thanks to Prof. Millar Burrows for reading the manuscript of this paper and contributing helpful suggestions.

⁹⁴ For instances of the latter type see Burney, *Judges*, lxxv; the number could now be increased considerably. Jirku (*op. cit.*, 25 f.) is off the right track when he assumes that the *ʿayin* of עֲרִי represents an older *ghayin*, because it corresponds to cuneiform *ḥ*. This is certainly a hasty conclusion. When he says (p. 6, n. 1) that "keilinschriftl. Ḥabiru die Umschrift von kana'an. 'Ibri (u. ä) ist, und nicht umgekehrt," he makes another statement that is philologically inadmissible. There is here no question of direct transliterations, but of two different forms. Since he assumes, however, that *ʿibri* was the original Canaanite form, he should have realized that it is precisely *ʿbr* which is well documented in West-Semitic, while *ḡbr* is very doubtful. Nor is Jirku more convincing when he attempts (p. 25) to trace the Hittite pronunciation of labials in the Egyptian renderings of Canaanite words. Phonetic questions require much more careful handling than that.

when flanked on either side by an *r*-sound.⁹⁵ In this predicament, however, a third source comes to our assistance.

There is nothing new in the suggestion that the names for the Ḥabiru and the Hebrews go back to the same source. Numerous objections to this equation have been raised from time to time, but few have persisted in their original skepticism on this point. This is due primarily to the fact that our knowledge of the Ḥabiru has increased considerably since the time when they first came to life in the Amarna records. We need no longer be baffled by the circumstance that the known Ḥabiru names are non-Semitic; the Nuzi documents show now a handsome majority in favor of the Semitic Ḥabiru. Moreover, references to the Ḥabiru in the Boghazköi records have helped to place the subject in a truer perspective. Historical considerations render the equation attractive; there are still many knotty problems in the whole subject, but the situation becomes hopeless if the equation is rejected. As regards the phonetics of the case, the first and the third consonants correspond exactly in the Hebrew *ʿibrî* (עברי), in *ʿApiru*, and in Ḥabiru. The second consonant is ambiguous both in cuneiform and in Egyptian, but not so in Hebrew: since the latter has *b*, the labial must be read as voiced in cuneiform, while the voiceless correspondent in the Egyptian form of the name is to be ascribed to local developments. In short, there is no objection to the assumption that the biblical word for the Hebrews corresponds phonetically with Ḥabiru and *ʿApiru*. There still remains a minor morphological difficulty (the relation of *ḥabiru* to *ʿibrî*), but it does not affect the situation vitally.⁹⁶

⁹⁵ Cf. the discussion by Mr. Gunn, note 93.

⁹⁶ Burney's statement (*Judges*, lxxiv) that the "philological equivalence of *Ha-bi-ru* with עִבְרִי is perfect" is too optimistic. It applies only to the phonetic equivalence of the stems involved. Morphologically, *ḥabiru* and עִבְרִי can be equated only on the assumption that the latter goes back to an earlier form *ʿabir(u)*. It so happens that such an assumption is entirely plausible (cf. e. g., Bauer-Leander, *Grammatik*, 14, n. 3); the form *qitl* may go back to an older *qatil*. But the following restriction must be imposed in this connection: forms of this type are derived from so-called stative, not transitive verbs. The noun עֶבֶר "message, book" could not be connected with Akk. *šapāru*, if that verb did not have by the side of the transitive impf. *ašpur* the stative *ašpar*. Similarly, *ʿabir* presupposes an impf. *ʿiʿbar*, just as the participle *ʿober* leads back to *ʿaʿbur*. Consequently, while *ʿober* (< *ʿābiru*) means "one who crosses," *ʿabir* must represent "one who is passing, transient, nomad." (We know that *šamiʿu* meant originally "one who is in a state of perceiving, hearing," *labiṣu* "one who dresses.") That biblical *ʿbr* specializes in the transitive meaning of the root is no proof that the stative connotation did not exist at the beginning of the second millennium, when *ḥabiru* is first reliably documented (time of Rim-Sin). Other verbs of this category have retained their stative forms throughout: thus Sem. *rakiba* "to ride," > Heb. impf. רָכַב.

The question is now in order as to a possible etymology for the term in question. The simplification of the consonantal backgrounds of the several related terms makes the problem easier than it was originally, but it fails to remove all the obstacles in our path. It is now reasonably certain that the name originated with Semites and that it goes back to a root *'br*. The principal meanings of that stem are "to cross, pass, traverse." The traditional derivation of *'ibrî* takes us back, as is well known, to the same root, Hebrews being originally those who had come from "across the river." Popular etymologies are, of course, very suspicious evidence; if such connections are to be credited at all, independent support must be produced. Now the same root is capable of yielding the meaning "passing from place to place," hence in a derivative sense "being a nomad." Such an interpretation is by no means inconsistent with what we have learned about the *Ḫabiru*. These groups appear to have been forever on the move. In Nuzi, some of the *Ḫabiru* come from Akkad, others from Ashur and even from Izalla. What worries the writers of the Amarna letters most is precisely this cruising habit of the *Ḫabiru*. They were nomads not in the same sense as the Bedouin, but in so far as they were not settled permanently in any definite locality; as such they were naturally foreigners to all with whom they came in contact, so that the name would come to denote both nomads and foreigners of a certain type. "Nomad" is not an ethnic designation; it is an appellative, but so was also *ḫabiru* at the start. As yet there is no way of establishing this etymology beyond the possibility of dispute; it appears, however, to be gaining in likelihood with each new strand of evidence.

It is still a long cry from the *Ḫabiru* of the Amarna records to the Hebrews of the Old Testament. The biblical term is general, to be sure, being applied to a group of peoples and not just to a single ethnic entity; nevertheless, the usage is largely ethnic. On the other hand, we know that the *Ḫabiru* represented in early times socially organized groups composed of members of various nationalities. But was this original status maintained? Apparently not everywhere, to judge from the frequent citations of *Ḫabiru* gods in the treaties of Boghazköi.⁹⁷ An increasing percentage of Semites among the *Ḫabiru* of the Amarna period may well have imparted to them a quasi-ethnic aspect. Upon their conquest of Canaan, the *Ḫabiru* settled in a district that was predominantly Semitic. Ultimately the area is found inhabited by Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, as well as Israelites; all of them must have absorbed considerable numbers of the *Ḫabiru* by whom they had been conquered. It is perfectly natural that the conquerors should have

⁹⁷ See above, note 92.

furnished thus a common designation which embraces these interrelated elements. Parallel with this course would be the development of the ethnic form *'ibrî* from an appellative *'abiru* (*habiru*).

I know that "may have been" and "perhaps" appear all too often in the above exposition. The material does not admit as yet of replacing probabilities with certainties. The picture which I have drawn echoes largely the views of a considerable number of scholars; it has, to my thinking, the advantage of incorporating the available historical indications into a tolerably well knit unit. The next step leads inevitably to a brief examination of the relevant passages in the Old Testament.

We have arrived at this point in the normal and logical sequence of our inquiry. For having reached an understanding as regards the philological connection of *habiru* and *'ibrî*, we must proceed with a further comparison of the cuneiform and biblical sources. What we have found out about the *Habiru* has some bearing on the question of the early Hebrews; perhaps the patriarchal narratives will help in return to place the *Habiru* on a somewhat firmer footing. It is not altogether a case of trying to explain one unknown proposition with the aid of another equally obscure, because useful information has been accumulating slowly at both ends. But we must not be too sanguine about the outcome of this cooperation; the danger of barking up the wrong tree is still uncomfortably close.

The age of the patriarchs has received much attention in recent years.⁹⁸ In a number of able studies the pertinent facts have been listed and evaluated. Many details remain obscure, but they need not break up the continuity of this presentation in view of the several discussions on the subject in which they have received adequate treatment. What is more urgent is reasonable agreement as to the main conclusions, but this has not been attained thus far. My sole excuse for making yet another attempt along these lines is a fresh approach from the Mesopotamian rather than the Canaanite angle. Epigraphic and archaeological sources have supplied new evidence which, added to the mass of previously accumulated material, may help to clarify the picture. The groundwork was laid in the preceding chapter, and it will be one of our tasks to point out anew the connection between the Hurrians and the Hebrews. Before that is done, however, we must examine briefly several biblical references to the patriarchs.

The main facts are clear enough. Abraham is the first one to be referred

⁹⁸ See Böhl, *Das Zeitalter Abrahams*, where the situation is admirably summarized. Cf. also Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, Dhorme, "Abraham dans le cadre de l'histoire," *RB*, 1928, pp. 367 ff., and the corresponding passages in Albright, *Archaeology*, and Olmstead, *Palestine*.

to specifically as "the Hebrew."⁹⁹ After a sojourn in Harran, which was an important stage in his reported journey from Ur of the Chaldees, Abraham arrives in the Promised Land. In the course of his numerous subsequent wanderings, Egypt is visited, but Canaan remains the land of his choice. Through their marriages, Isaac and Jacob maintain the contacts with the middle Euphrates area, but it is in Egypt that Jacob and his family finally settle. The rise of Joseph contrasts sharply with the following period of Oppression, which leads at length to the Exodus and the ultimate Conquest of the Promised Land. Throughout the entire period the Euphrates and the Nile constitute the two termini in the wanderings of the patriarchs who provide in turn a living bridge between the two culture lands. This fact is of outstanding importance for our inquiry.

If Abraham had not been called a Hebrew, we should be nevertheless justified in classing him with the Ḥabiru. He is plainly a soldier of fortune, forever on the move. In his case Hebrew or Ḥabiru may be still applied in an appellative sense; in fact, the Septuagint does just that when it translates the word העברי as ὁ περάτης "he who has crossed over, transient." But we witness also a growing ethnic consciousness: the wives of Isaac and Jacob must be of Aramaic stock; even in later times the ancestor of the Israelites is remembered as a "wandering Aramaean,"¹⁰⁰ or, perhaps better, a fugitive one. Moreover, a religious reason is said to have been the cause of Abraham's wanderings. We see thus in this particular Ḥabiru group a strengthening of ethnic ties and the parallel evolution of certain religious ideas. There is certainly nothing illogical in the assumption that the history of the House of Abraham had many analogues among other Ḥabiru groups, or that many Arameans were to be found among the Ḥabiru.¹⁰¹

There is today no reason to doubt the authenticity of the general background of the patriarchal narratives. In point of fact, recent discoveries have greatly increased our respect for their essential accuracy. It is not a question of the historicity of the principal persons involved; what is of moment in this connection is the fact that lives like theirs, full of apparently insignificant incidents, can now be duplicated or reconstructed, almost incident by incident, from a number of cuneiform records dating from the first half of the second millennium.

⁹⁹ Gen. 14. 13.

¹⁰⁰ Deut. 26. 5. The meaning "fugitive" suits the context as well as "wandering" and is closer to the Akk. *abātu*, with which it has been linked.

¹⁰¹ Forrer (*Reallex. d. Assyri.*, 235) equates the Ḥabiru with the Semitic merchants of the Cappadocian tablets. At any rate, there is no doubt that the Ḥabiru were more prominent, and powerful, in the west than in Babylonia and Arrapha.

To study the numerous parallels in social conditions as reflected in the Nuzi records and in the Pentateuch would require a lengthy monograph. A work of this type is now an urgent need. No justice can be done to the subject in a paper such as this where the space at our disposal is very limited. I must refrain, therefore, from doing more than merely calling attention to the correspondences which have been pointed out by Smith and Gadd,¹⁰² Albright,¹⁰³ and others,¹⁰⁴ adding only one or two fresh examples. The removal by Rachel of her father's house gods, which puzzled countless generations of biblical students, has received a simple and correct explanation through the publication of the Arrapha documents. We know now that according to Hurrian law the possession of such *teraphim* by the woman's husband insured title to the property of his father-in-law. Before her marriage to Jacob, there was not much that Rachel could do to prevent the exploitation of her patient suitor by the greedy Laban. But as soon as Jacob completed his term of service, she promptly took the law into her hands. Here is one of the incidents in the lives of the patriarchs, the true significance of which had probably been lost in pre-Davidic times. Other episodes have also received much illumination from the Nuzi documents. There is, e. g., the provision in one of the marriage contracts, that the bridegroom must not take to himself another wife unless the bride fails to bear him children. In that case, it devolves upon the woman to furnish a concubine from among the servants; the bride is enjoined to treat humanely the eventual offspring of that concubine.¹⁰⁵ This contract might have been written for Abraham and Sarah; nor was Sarah's treatment of Hagar in any way exceptional, the law finding it necessary to obviate such abuses. The entire episode would be a normal occurrence in Arrapha towards the middle of the second millennium; it could scarcely have been invented by the Hebrew writers of the first millennium. Another interesting analogue from Nuzi is a legal arrangement as to the disposition of the birthright: one of the parties acquires the rights of the firstborn, while the other, whose claims to the privilege would have been actually justified by reason of birth, is satisfied to accept a minor share in his father's estate;¹⁰⁶ the eldest son was, of course, entitled to a double share. The deal between Jacob and Esau involving the question of birthright was thus by no means unprecedented.

But we must not digress any further. Two things are made plain by this remarkable interrelationship of Hurrian and patriarchal documents. Firstly,

¹⁰² *RA* XXIII, 126 f.

¹⁰³ *Op. cit.*, 138 f.

¹⁰⁴ *Mesop. Orig.*, 162. Cf. also *JAOS* 52, p. 365.

¹⁰⁵ *ANNUAL* IX, 31 f.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 48 f.

the narratives of Genesis with which we have been concerned find a well authenticated background in contemporary extra-biblical sources. Secondly, there were intimate cultural contacts between the Ḫabiru and the Hurrians, prior to the Amarna period at least.¹⁰⁷ It follows that we cannot afford to disregard lightly the information contained in the patriarchal stories, no matter what we may think about the historicity of the individual heroes. Since the minor incidents are demonstrably in keeping with the times, not to say conditioned by them, it is likely that the accounts of the migrations of Abraham and his descendants have some foundation in fact.¹⁰⁸ What we need is external confirmation of these accounts or, failing that, reliable indications that such movements fit well into contemporary history. In other words, the events must be examined from the Egyptian angle. Before this is done, however, it will be necessary to return for a moment to the question of Ḫabiru-Hurrian relations.

We have seen that the Hurrians were a non-Semitic race occupying in the second millenium large portions of the Near East. The Ḫabiru, on the other hand, were migratory groups, largely Semitic, found in practically the same areas in which the Hurrians are encountered. It is especially significant that Harran, which was at worst the secondary home of the patriarchs, lay in the heart of the Mitanni empire. In these circumstances it is not difficult to account for the cultural dependence of the Ḫabiru upon the Hurrians. Nomadic or semi-nomadic groups will naturally borrow much from those settled

¹⁰⁷ It is still a question whether some of the racial characteristics of the modern Jews are to be attributed to the contacts of their ancestors with the Hurrians (*Mesop. Orig.*, 155), or whether they were acquired through intermarriages with "the Asiatics" at some other period. The former alternative appears to be the more probable one of the two.

¹⁰⁸ Gen. 14 is a potentially valuable document, but its precise background is still obscure. See the excellent discussion by Albright, *JSOR* X, 231 ff. Cf. also Böhl, *op. cit.*, 12 ff., and Dougherty, *Sealand of Arabia*, 33 ff. It is most unfortunate that some writers still maintain the philologically impossible and historically precarious equation of Amraphel ('*mrpl*') with Hammurabi. Albright's view that the biblical name contains the element Amurru (*loc. cit.*, 259) is unquestionably sound. It may be noted that the name *Amurrah/pi* (definitely with the element Amurru: wr. also *MAR.TU-a-bi/pi*) is now attested in the Nuzi tablets; cf. *HSS* IX, 120.6, 13; *RA* XXVIII, p. 39, text 7.9. Is '*mrpl*' in any way related to it? As for Arioch ('*rik*'), the phonetic equivalence with the Hurrian name *Ariukki* (cf. *RA* XXIII, p. 156, text 53.27) is perfect. Whatever city (or land) Ellasar may represent, its repeated equation with the Babylonian Larsa by Langdon is unwarranted. Tid'al is probably one of the Hittite kings who bore the name *Tudḫaliyaš* (Böhl, *op. cit.*, 15 ff.), and Shin'ar is evidently *Sinḡar* (Albright, *loc. cit.*, 256). But some vital links in this chain are still missing.

elements with whom they are in contact most frequently, especially when the wanderers themselves are about to change to a settled mode of life. The Ḫabiru of Nuzi or of Harran would normally take over many of the Hurrian customs. Whether they were able to preserve their identity or were absorbed by the Hurrians was evidently in each case a question of respective numerical strength. At any rate, there must have been considerable racial intermixture between these differently organized elements.

It remains now to see whether the same two groups were capable also of political cooperation. It will be remembered that the Hurrians scattered over the Near East in the course and partly as a result of extensive ethnic movements, while the Ḫabiru were no doubt aided in their own pursuits by the upheaval that was responsible for these migrations. The situation was manifestly favorable to military alliances. Before the above questions can be answered, however, we must turn for a while to Egyptian sources. Egypt too suffered from, and preserved some record of, the migrations of the second millennium. These records are, unfortunately, far from complete. One thing emerges none the less with sufficient clarity: the contemporary invasion of Egypt is ascribed to an indeterminate group of foreigners who are to figure in history as the Hyksos.

To touch upon the Hyksos problem is still much like stirring up a hornet's nest. Certain is only the conquest of Egypt by the Hyksos and their subsequent domination of the country for a considerable number of years; even the exact duration of the foreign rule is as yet in dispute. When it comes to identifying the invaders with any definite people or group of peoples, there is a disconcertingly wide range of conflicting opinions.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, recent discoveries have not been without some effect on this perplexing problem; certain aspects of it have lost much of their former vagueness and have acquired clearer outlines. But this process of crystallization has still a long way to go. Our own invasion of Egypt would in these circumstances be utter folly if we were not forced into it by the course which this inquiry has taken. Having found a common meeting ground for the Ḫabiru and the Hurrians, we can no longer ignore the Hyksos. All three groups share the distinction of having participated in the migrations that we have been discussing. Does the relationship between the Ḫabiru and the Hyksos extend beyond these external characteristics?

The purely general nature of the term Hyksos has already been indicated. The name meant originally "ruler of the foreign lands (desert)." In this

¹⁰⁹ See the valuable summary by W. Wolf, "Der Stand der Hyksosfrage," *ZDMG* 83, pp. 67 ff.

sense it is used of the Bedouin chieftain 'bš³, who is pictured in a painting from Beni Hasan, which dates from the Twelfth Dynasty. There were Hyksos, then, before the great invasion of Egypt; moreover, they were Semites. The same chieftain from Beni Hasan might have been called in Babylonia a Ḫabiru, or rather a sheikh of the Ḫabiru. By the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty the term Hyksos had ceased to designate "rulers," but was applied more generally to Asiatic "foreigners" as a group. To Manetho, who etymologizes the compound as "shepherd kings," the Hyksos were specifically the foreign invaders of Egypt.

That the great event of the freeing of the land from foreign domination made such a slight impression upon Egyptian writers is an indication of the poor historical sense of the Egyptians.¹¹⁰ Native sources show little interest in the whole matter; that is why there is today a Hyksos problem. Modern scholars have had to rely largely on the indirect method of deduction. It is evident that the Hyksos had arrived in Egypt by way of Palestine. The invaders made their last stand against Egyptian liberators on Palestinian soil; Hyksos scarabs and pottery, burials and fortifications, have been discovered in Palestine in a number of sites;¹¹¹ the impetus gathered during the war of liberation carries Egyptian kings far into Syria; moreover, even at the height of the Hyksos power they had their capital close to the Asiatic border. Further support for the Asiatic origin of the Hyksos is derived from the fact that Egyptian potters revert to painted ornamentation during the time in question; vase-painting had been out of fashion in Egypt since the beginning of the historical age, but Syria and Palestine maintained the art all along;¹¹² even more conclusive is the identity of certain motives on the painted Egyptian fabrics of the Hyksos age and on contemporary Asiatic wares.¹¹³ Archaeology furnishes also other corroborative arguments, but these need not be discussed here.¹¹⁴ The Asiatic origin of the Hyksos is universally conceded. It is equally plain, however, that the Near East of the pre-Amarna and Amarna periods sheltered a bewildering variety of ethnic, political, and social units. Which of these had supplied the Hyksos?

¹¹⁰ Cf. Gunn and Gardiner, "The Expulsion of the Hyksos," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 1918, pp. 36 ff.

¹¹¹ For the archaeological sequence of the Hyksos remains see above, note 61.

¹¹² Cf. Frankfort, *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East* II, 166.

¹¹³ Especially the bird motive, cf. Frankfort, *ibid.*, 167, and Speiser, *Museum Journal* XXIII, pl. lxiv. Cf. also the references to the studies of Albright given in note 52.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Wolf, *op. cit.*, 74 f. The article of Jirku "Aufstieg und Untergang der Hyksos," *JPOS* XII, 51 ff., may be mentioned here for the sake of the literature which it lists.

They have been sought among the Cassites, Hittites, Indo-Iranians, Hurrians, and Semites. The most serious recent candidates have been the Semites and the Hurrians. In favor of the former it is held that among the Hyksos names found on scarabs the majority are clearly Semitic; this is an undeniable fact. Those who support the Hurrian claim point to the power of Mitanni in immediately post-Hyksos times;¹¹⁵ that too is irrefutable, though less conclusive in its bearing on Egyptian history. The Indo-Iranians have been linked with the arrival of the horse in Egypt, an introduction datable to the Hyksos period; but the Aryans cannot be ridden into Egypt on horseback, as it were, for there may have been other intermediaries. The claims of the Cassites are too far-fetched, literally, and those of the Hittites anachronistic.

The one definite racial element among the Hyksos is Semitic; the onomastic evidence is direct in this respect. By the same token, however, the invaders must have consisted of other elements as well; for a percentage of Hyksos names is clearly non-Semitic; the best known being that of *Hian*, the king whose objects have been discovered as far apart as Crete and Baghdad. To conclude from this latter fact that the Hyksos empire extended at one time from the islands of the eastern Mediterranean all the way to Mesopotamia, as is sometimes done, indicates a degree of optimism that is entirely unwarranted by the meager evidence. At most, it may be assumed that relatives of the Hyksos were to be found in those areas, but not necessarily as rulers; foreign visitors could have brought with them objects inscribed with the name of their chieftain, without implying thereby any power on the part of that chieftain over the visited centers. At all events, it is clear that among the Hyksos there were other strains besides the Semitic. And, to have done with the linguistic material, some Hyksos bear good Egyptian names:¹¹⁶ here we have evidence of the assimilatory influence of the subjects upon their conquerors.

The non-Semitic component among the Hyksos cannot thus be identified on philological grounds. We must look, therefore, for other evidence. We have seen that the Hurrians have been mentioned prominently in this connection, too prominently perhaps, considering the nature of the arguments adduced. To my thinking, the Hurrian side could be pressed more strongly than has been done hitherto; with the distinct understanding, however, that

¹¹⁵ Meyer, *Geschichte* II. 1 (1928), pp. 41 ff.; Pieper, *OLZ*, 1925, 417 f. Götze, *Hethiter-Reich*, 22, lacks the necessary proof, and Hrozný, *AOr* III, 288, fails to support his statement with any argument whatever.

¹¹⁶ Several Hyksos princes used the name Apepi.

the Semites cannot possibly be left out of the picture. First and foremost is the well established fact that the Hurrian migration, which coincides roughly in time with the invasion of the Hyksos, is the most extensive one about which we have any record. The conquest of Egypt was obviously the result of a migration of similar proportions. We have traced the Hurrians as far as the southern shores of the Dead Sea; there is no indication that the movement spent itself there and then without continuing towards the Nile Valley. It is certain that there were Hurrians in Egypt by the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty, to judge from the names of captives brought back by the kings who had gone forth in pursuit of the Hyksos.¹¹⁷ These slaves are even called *Huru*, which we know to represent *Hurri*. To be sure, the name is now used generally for the adjoining Asiatic territory and its inhabitants; among the *Huru* slaves there are some who bear Semitic names. But the earlier power of the Hurrians is shown by the fact that the Egyptians had named the country after them. A similar argument is furnished by the Hyksos pottery found in Egypt. Its bird motives are Hurrian, as may be seen from the ample material of the Hurrian strata of Tell Billa and the Palestinian analogues.¹¹⁸ Furthermore, we have seen that the name of the Hyksos king *Hian* was found both in Crete and in Babylonia. These occurrences are indeed insufficient to prove Hyksos rule in these distant countries, but they bespeak nevertheless actual contacts with the Hyksos. Now we know definitely that Hurrians were present in Mesopotamia and that they had intimate cultural relations with the Aegean lands. Lastly, though I would not set as much weight by this argument as by the others, there is a possible linguistic survival of Hurrian in Egyptian. It is admitted that not only the horse but also the chariot were introduced into Egypt during the Hyksos period. The names for such importations are usually borrowed from the exporters or the intermediaries in the case. It is not surprising, therefore, to discover in the Egyptian terms for horse, parts of the chariot, reins, etc., evident Canaanite loanwords. Of the two words for the chariot itself, one is the good Semitic name *mrkb(t)*; the other one is *wrrjt*, for which there is no satisfactory Egyptian etymology;¹¹⁹ it is highly probable that the name is a borrowing like the rest.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Gustavs, *ZÄS* 64, pp. 54 ff.

¹¹⁸ See above, note 113. A full discussion of the facts would require a separate article.

¹¹⁹ Wolf, *loc. cit.*, 73. Mr. Gunn has again been good enough to collect and interpret the Egyptian material on the subject. I give his note verbatim:

"One of the Egyptian words for "chariot" is first found at the very beginning of the 18th Dynasty, written *wrt* (Sethe, *Urkunden* IV, 3/6). Normally, however, in the 18th and 19th Dynasties, it is written *wrrjt*, sometimes more summarily *wrrt*, and the writing with one *r* seems hardly to reappear until the 8th century (cf. Stela of

Now the Hurrian term for chariot has recently been discovered, and it is not unlikely that we have here the prototype of *wrrjt*;¹²⁰ but we know as yet too little about Hurrian phonology to make this derivation a certainty. Regard-

Piankhi, lines 30, 89)—a similar vacillation between *wr* and *wrr* is seen in three other words having this stem. The word is sometimes written with the chariot as ideogram, whether followed or not by the ending *t* (e. g. *Urkunden* IV, 692/2, 712/9. 10; Sphinx Stela, line 5), and this is pretty strong evidence for its being a native Egyptian word. In hieratic it occurs in a mixed "syllabic" and normal writing, the elements *wr*, *j*, *t*, being written normally, while the second *r* is represented by a group mostly reserved for use in foreign words (e. g., Anast. Pap. I, 24/4 and cf. 19/5; d'Orbiney Pap. 17/4). Cases of native Egyptian words similarly written are however not rare; see on this Erman, *Neuaeg. Gramm.*, 2nd edn., sect. 31. The final *t* can hardly be other than the feminine termination, which was still sounded before pronominal suffixes (examples Anast. Pap. I, *loc. cit.*), though it had in general dropped off; the fact that in Late Egyptian this was one of the comparatively few words which could still take the possessive suffix would appear to be further evidence for its native origin. The grammatical gender of the word is, already in Late Middle Egyptian (18th Dyn.), curiously variable; side by side with clear examples of its treatment as a feminine (e. g., *Urkunden* IV, 657/5, 663/12, 14), are many in which it is used as masculine (e. g., *Urk.* IV, 690/9, 692/2, 704/15, 712/9, 10, 717/11). The etymology of the word is obscure: the only Egyptian word from which it could be derived appears to be *wrr* "to be great". It may be added that "war-chariot" is not the only meaning of *wrrjt*; it is used also of chariots used by kings and others for excursions and travel.

"One difficulty in identifying the Egyptian *wrrjt*, *wr(j)t* "chariot" with the Hurrian *warat* (see below) is, that the former is written with the normal *t*-sign, which, when (as doubtless here) it represents the feminine ending, is mostly a merely historic writing, the feminine *t* having been dropped (except in *casus constructus* and before suffixes) many centuries before, leaving a short vowel as the termination; while on the other hand, in every case known to me in which the Egyptians heard a *t* at the end of a foreign word, that consonant is represented by one of the *t*-groups of the "syllabic" writing. B. G."

¹²⁰ The Hurrian word in question is *waratušhu*. The meaning is made clear by the context: *bitum(tum) wa-ra-tù-uš-hu qa-du ru-uk-bi-šu-ma*, HSS V, 72. 13, and Speiser, ANNUAL X, 53 f., "the chariot-shed together with its chariots." (The sequel deals with stables.) The form is to be analyzed as *waratu-š-hu*, with the formative element *š*, and the adjectival suffix *hi* (here akkadianized to *hu*); for examples cf. Thureau-Dangin, *Syria*, 1931, p. 260; the word may be translated as "the (place) of chariots." Now Mr. Gunn has concluded that *wr(j)t* and its cognates are treated like other Egyptian words, even though their behavior as regards gender is unusual and their etymology obscure. Naturally, I defer to Mr. Gunn's decision as to the Egyptian angle of the question. On the other hand, in view of the fact that most of the related terms were borrowed by the Egyptians (Wolf, *loc. cit.*, 73), and that *wr(j)t* is first found in Egyptian at the time of the *waratu-š-hu* text, one wonders whether the former does not represent, after all, a thoroughly egyptianized designation. The preoccupation of the Hurrians with the subject is proved by the now classical text of the Mitannian Kikkuli. New material may help to settle the problem.

less of the last point, there can be little doubt at present that the Hurrians constituted an important element among the Hyksos, in addition to the Semites.

Were there yet other strains among the invaders? The non-Semitic Hyksos names do not seem to be Hurrian either.¹²¹ Cuneiform sources of the second millennium confront us with Indo-Iranian elements in Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia, and with Indo-Europeanized strains in Asia Minor.¹²² If the ethnic composition of Palestine and Syria during the Amarna period may be taken as a cross-section of the Hyksos who had retreated from Egypt, then we must assume that there were also Indo-Iranians among the Hyksos. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that the typical Hyksos fortification, which was so happily identified by Albright, is not normal in the Near East. We find thus an element that is still unidentified, and yet it is one of obvious importance, since it played a vital part in the military organization of the Hyksos. Is the new component to be connected with the Indo-Iranians, or does it represent yet another element? Plainly, we have reached the limits allowed for reasonable deduction. We may not know the answer to this question until we have located the ultimate force behind our migrations. Meanwhile it is time to "sign off" and to coordinate the results attained thus far.

We have seen, then, that the Hyksos were composed of several disparate groups. They were not simply Semites, or Hurrians, but definitely a conglomeration of Semites and Hurrians, with an admixture of other strains which defy identification for the present. Nor is it possible to determine when and where this combine was effected; it may have been organized in Syria or Palestine, or it may have grown on Egyptian soil. With at least one hundred years required for the Hyksos rule of Egypt, there enters into our considerations a distinct chronological factor. We have archaeological reasons for postulating an earlier and a later Hyksos period, and this stratification is likely to correspond with ethnic shifts within the Hyksos.¹²³ To judge from sources available to date, Semites and Hurrians, who formed manifestly the great majority of the Hyksos, were the first to conquer northern Egypt. For although Indo-Iranians appear in the cuneiform records from about the middle of the second millenium, they are absent in the earlier Hurrian documents (including those from Arrapha). At all events, they supplied in Mitanni a thin layer of ruling aristocracy, while the bulk of the

¹²¹ Notwithstanding the contrary assertion of Meyer, *loc. cit.*, 42.

¹²² Cf. Mironov, *Aryan Vestiges*.

¹²³ For the archaeological sequence of the Hyksos remains see above, note 61.

population was heterogeneous. We are thus back to the Ḥabiru-Hurrian partnership, which we have seen at work in the middle Euphrates area, and whose trail has been picked up in Egypt. There remains, however, the possibility that the Ḥabiru were the first to overrun the Delta, having been driven thither by waves of Hurrians set in motion by the larger migration.

How does this blend of facts and theories fit in with the patriarchal narratives? Abraham's visit to Egypt does not have the characteristics of a movement on a larger scale.¹²⁴ It gives rather the impression of a peaceful entry, much in the manner of the caravan portrayed at Beni Hasan, with which it has often and rightly been compared, though the two sheikhs need not, of course, be viewed as contemporaries. But several generations later the situation is markedly different. This time it is the entire "House of Jacob" that comes down to Egypt and stays there; in other words, a proper migration is recorded. It is hardly necessary to point out afresh how easily the career of Joseph shades off into the Hyksos background. Our historical difficulties date from a later period, the time of the king who knew not Joseph. They center around two principal problems: the relation of the Israelites to the Ḥabiru-Hebrews, and the nature and date of the Exodus.

Thus far we have had a fair proportion of facts to serve as a foundation for theories. With the rise of the Hyksos, however, the faint flow of information comes to a sudden halt. External and Egyptian sources become strangely silent at this point. The Old Testament is now our only guide and, although archaeology has taught us to respect its accounts, history cannot approve them for the time being for want of extra-biblical corroboration. It is indeed a dark interlude between the death of Joseph and the Conquest of Canaan. Having brought us to a dead end, our discussion must now be concluded; but the conclusion will be less abrupt if we interpose a tentative working hypothesis.

It goes without saying that we are not concerned here with the later tribal composition of Israel and Judah; this is purely an inner-biblical problem. Our interest is confined to the relation of Israel, the term being broadly representative of the descendants of Jacob, to the larger Hebrew group. There can now be little serious opposition to identifying the Semitic element among the Hyksos with an offshoot of the Ḥabiru, which is traceable to Abraham העברי, i. e., "the nomad." It follows that these Ḥabiru participated in the Hyksos rule of Egypt; they must not be confused with the Ḥabiru of the Amarna letters, who threaten Palestine long after the expulsion of the Hyksos. The enemies of ARAD-Ḥepa and of the other vassals of Egypt clearly belong

¹²⁴ Cf. Peet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, 47 ff.

to a later wave. ARAD-Hepa himself is a Hurrian; ¹²⁵ his ancestors arrived apparently with the other Hyksos, in a group that was strong enough to cause Palestine to be called Huru by the Egyptians. The expulsion of the Hyksos did not entail, of course, their complete extermination, and it is not unnatural to find a Hurrian prince in Jerusalem during the latter part of the Eighteenth Dynasty. That he is apprehensive of the Habiru in common with the other princes of Palestine and Syria is but another indication that the Josephite and the Amarna Habiru belonged to different movements that were centuries apart. For we have seen that the earlier Semitic invaders had made common cause with the Hurrians.

We must emphasize this distinction between the Habiru, or Hebrews, of the patriarchal period and those of the Amarna age. Which of these groups was responsible for the Israelites? Undoubtedly both, though not to the same extent. Tradition traces back the formation of Israel as a nation to the period of the sojourn in Egypt, or more specifically, to the time of oppression. Tradition names also religion as a vital distinguishing characteristic between the "Israelites" and their neighbors. There is evidently an element of truth in both accounts. We know that racial differences alone were not decisive in this connection. There were Habiru in Egypt even after the Exodus, ¹²⁶ no matter how late we place its date; for we find the 'Apiru down to the time of Ramesses IV, as late as the Twentieth Dynasty, long after the reported defeat of the Israelites in Palestine according to the famous passage in the stele of Merneptah. The Exodus did not involve therefore all the Habiru of Egypt. On the other hand, it is equally plain that all the tribes, as we know them from biblical history, cannot be derived from Egypt. The dual conquest of Canaan, from the north as well as from the south, is now scarcely open to doubt. In short, we cannot but assume ultimate cooperation between the followers of Moses and a section of the northern invaders. But just as was the case in Egypt, all Hebrews did not come under Israel. The

¹²⁵ Maisler's argument that this prince was an Amorite (*Untersuchungen*, 37, and *JPOS* X, 189), is wholly unconvincing. The fact that he used in his letters a Semitic dialect carries no more weight in this connection than the Akkadian letters of Tushratta. Hepa is a demonstrably Hurrian goddess (Gustavs, *Ta'annek*, 10) and her admission into the Amorite pantheon is far from established. Even in Davidic times Jerusalem is inhabited by the non-Semitic clan of Jebusites, and Arawna is certainly not an Amorite name. To say with Maisler that the Jebusites arrived in the land after 1300 B. C. is to beg the question.

¹²⁶ Cf. the material collected by Mr. Gunn, note 93. It is hardly necessary to point out anew that the term *'ibri*, when its use is attributed by the Bible to the Egyptians, is employed as a general designation. It refers manifestly to the Semitic Asiatics without differentiating between the peoples or tribes in question.

events that led up to the emergence of the nation, even in that inchoate state in which we find it under David, are still obscure for the most part. In these circumstances we cannot go far wrong if we give tradition the benefit of the doubt and accept its verdict to the effect that much of the implied organization and preliminary effort took place as a measure of self-defence against Egypt.

Nor can we go wrong if we call a halt at this point. The indulgence of the reader must not be exposed to further test. Speculations, however legitimate, must be anchored to something definite; at this stage of our study the last bit of support for conjectures disappears, and it is not our province to resume investigations at the other edge of the gap. The subject or set of subjects, which we have been considering is much like an enormous jigsaw puzzle, fascinating and infinitely complicated. The outlines of the picture are becoming visible, and links have appeared between individual figures. But the whole tableau is still incomplete, because some of the pieces have not been fitted and others are still missing.